

WITHDRAWN

REDWOOD



LIBRARY

NEWPORT

R.I.

Gift of
Miss Martha C. Codman

A CENTURY OF WORK FOR ANIMALS

THE HISTORY OF THE R.S.P.C.A.

1824—1924

[*All rights reserved*]



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024



RICHARD MARTIN, M.P.

From the picture presented to the R.S.P.C.A. by Mrs. Ratcliff Chambers.

A CENTURY OF WORK FOR ANIMALS

THE HISTORY OF THE R.S.P.C.A., 1824-1924

BY

EDWARD G. FAIRHOLME

CHIEF SECRETARY, R.S.P.C.A.

AND

WELLESLEY PAIN

EDITOR, R.S.P.C.A.

FOREWORD BY

H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G.

PRESIDENT OF THE R.S.P.C.A.

INTRODUCTION BY LORD LAMBOURNE, C.V.O.

CHAIRMAN, R.S.P.C.A.

"COMPASSION," AN ODE, BY THOMAS HARDY, O.M.

"Every great and commanding movement in the annals
of the world is the triumph of enthusiasm."

EMERSON.

REDWOOD LIBRARY

NEWPORT, R. I.

NEW YORK

E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY

1924

g,
DEC 8 1924 e

1Z

F 16

TO THE MEMORY
OF
THE EARLY PIONEERS,

WHO, FACING DERISION AND CONTEMPT, OVERCAME PREJUDICE,
IGNORANCE, AND SELFISHNESS, AND BY THEIR COURAGE AND PER-
SISTENCE EDUCATED PUBLIC OPINION TO RECOGNIZE THE CLAIMS OF
ANIMALS FOR JUSTICE,

AND TO THOSE OTHERS

WHO ARE CARRYING ON THE WORK, AND, BY THEIR LABOUR, ENABLE
THE SEEDS SOWN TO FLOURISH AND BEAR FRUIT EVEN IN THE MOST
DISTANT PARTS OF THE WORLD,

THIS BOOK
IS GRATEFULLY DEDICATED.

E. G. F.
W. P.

1924.

FOREWORD



ST JAMES' PALACE.

S. W. I.

March 6th, 1924.

There is in the heart of every member of our race to-day a real love of animals and a desire to befriend them. This History of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals of which I am proud to be the President, reveals the unpleasant truth that this trait in the British character is of comparatively modern growth. A hundred years ago animals had but few friends, even in this country, but happily those friends were staunch. Ignoring the ridicule and abuse that assailed them, they set to work to overcome the many obstacles that ignorance, thoughtlessness, and callous indifference put in their way. Their self-appointed task - the protection of animals - was appallingly difficult, but in the end they accomplished it. Possibly those early humanitarians never realised the magnitude of the success they had won; to-day it is apparent to all, and both man and beast are the better for it. For though it may be that the man who protects an animal from ill-treatment acts solely with the object of befriending the animal, yet none the less his kindly deed reacts upon his own character and makes him a better citizen. May I suggest therefore that in contemplating what the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals has done, and is doing, for animals, we should not lose sight of the humanising effect of its work on the hearts of the community?

Edward P

INTRODUCTION

BY LORD LAMBOURNE

(CHAIRMAN OF THE R.S.P.C.A.)

IN these days, when progress has become, so to speak, a world-creed, and each succeeding generation flatters itself superior to the former, it may well be asked whether, when all is said and done, our manners, customs, and ideas are really an improvement on those of a hundred years ago.

I presume that by progress is meant improvement—improvement, that is to say, in the conditions of life and society generally. In other words, a continuous advance towards some goal where happiness and contentment reign supreme. Whether or no any such Elysium is the prize of mortals is open to doubt. But, be that as it may, progress in any path of life presupposes an ideal, failing which, stagnation and ultimate retrogression inevitably follow.

There is nothing static in the complex mechanism of everyday life; the tide of civilization must either ebb or flow, and what we have to ask ourselves is whether this century is an improvement on the last and how far each one of us has contributed to make it so. The question is difficult to answer; so much depends on the ideal which each one of us sets out to attain. But, however different our goals and range, it is, I think, possible to some extent to calculate how far we are wide of our mark or whether, indeed, we have set the correct sight at all. And this brings me

to the immediate subject of our interest—the Society of which it is my honour to be Chairman.

In this, the year of our centenary, which synchronizes with what is considered a golden year of progress—presumably, therefore, of social happiness—it is well that we, members of this Society, should look back and satisfy ourselves, if possible, that we are nearer our ideal than those who originally set our course.

And the stretch is not so long. In 1824, George IV. was on the throne; the “First Gentleman in Europe” was indulging to the full in the sports and pleasures of his day. They seem very laboured to us, these amusements of our grandfathers, and very distasteful. At the same time, we should do well not to be too harsh in our judgment, for depend upon it, strive as we may, we in our turn shall be criticized by our successors.

But what were the conditions of everyday life at the beginning of the nineteenth century? One has only to read the chronicles of the times to realize that drink was looked upon as a sort of duty that an Englishman owed to himself and the revenue of his country. Rowdyism was a prevalent form of amusement, whilst, as for high-spirited “larks” as they were described, even the younger Pitt, with his Lord Chancellor and Treasurer of the Navy, found much delight, on one occasion, in forcing a turnpike and being fired at for his pains. Duelling, of course, was frequent among the higher classes, and ruinous gambling the order of the day.

But there were other forms of sport which were none the less popular and were certainly more generally indulged in—such, for instance, as bear-baiting,

and the equally brutalizing sport of bull-baiting. For centuries both were as keenly followed as our modern football. But the day came, in 1835, when the tide of public opinion was turned against such spectacles, and both were abolished by law. Once the humane feeling was aroused—and your Society undoubtedly brought it to the threshold of consciousness—there was no reaction. Five years later, cock-fighting became illegal; and before very long, duck-hunting, an old English sport little remembered now, where the bird was pinioned, thrown into a pond with a spaniel, from which it could only escape by diving. I had almost forgotten badger-baiting, as cruel a sport as any, which, although forbidden a few years after, long survived in London cellars. It is not generally known, but, until 1852, duelling was not only an affair of honour, but combats were arranged between men—and women, too—purely on business lines; as also boxing, which in the reign of George IV. was the attraction of half the drinking haunts in town and country.

I could quote many other sports equally vicious, which for generations held sway in England but which are now unknown. Happily the list is long, but even in these days can we say that the index is complete?

And if we look back on this vista of a hundred years and take a general view, can we say that progress has brought happiness and contentment in its train? Are we in England any nearer the ideal? It is true that the two and three bottle men have disappeared; that responsible politicians no longer “skylark” publicly; that one seldom hears of fortunes being won or lost at the gaming tables, or of duels. But if this is all that the progress of a hundred years can lay claim to,

there is little to boast of in the achievement. And yet there is something that the past century may rightly lay to its credit, and that is the ever-increasing interest in the welfare of dumb animals. Who can deny the progress that has been made in this direction? The days of bear-baiting, cock-fighting, and other such sport in which our forefathers delighted have gone—let us hope for ever. And if I am told that in our time cruelty to animals has merely taken another form, the answer is that, whereas formerly the sufferings of the victims were not considered, to-day, even the most callous and hard-hearted are at least conscious that cruelty in any shape or form is inhuman. That is, indeed, an advance along the road of progress of which we, as a Society, may justly congratulate ourselves, for from the outset it was realized that reform of the heart far more than reform of the law was the true goal of our efforts. To paraphrase the well-known lines “The way has been long, the wind has been cold, but having a great and fixed ideal always before us, we have stayed our course, no matter how contrary the wind, until at last it has almost seemed that the very stars are favouring our journey.” As a Society, we have indeed achieved much. Many of us, looking back on our lives, can bear witness to that. But great as has been the improvement in the care and treatment of all dumb animals, there is still much to be done.

It is a sad reflection, but nevertheless true, that nothing really great was ever achieved in a hurry. But there it is, Nature, the wise mother of us all, works slowly but surely. There is no forcing her pace, however much we may think it desirable. And so all that we can do is to work diligently on the

material supplied to us and be sure that we waste not the hours or allow our tools to blunt. Meanwhile, I would have you remember that as the invention of one generation is the ordinary mechanism of the next, so in the social sphere future generations may condemn pleasures which to-day appear to us harmless. Who knows, but in the years to come public opinion may decide that the professional athlete, like the Roman gladiator, is a danger to the State? And surely there are already indications that the lust of sport is reacting dangerously on the industrial welfare of the community. But, be that as it may, I believe that future generations, influenced by humane teaching, will learn to regard life, in any form, as a sacred trust; I believe, too, that sympathy will extend to the farthest limits of animal creation. And if the national character can be influenced in this direction, then, e'er this century has run its course, sport, in so far as it necessitates the taking of life or causing pain, will not only cease to produce either pleasure or excitement, but cruelty and suffering which are too often the result will no longer be charged against the heart of man.

COMPASSION

AN ODE

IN CELEBRATION OF THE CENTENARY OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY FOR
THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

BY THOMAS HARDY

I.

Backward among the dusky years
A lonesome lamp is seen arise,
Lit by a few fain pioneers
Before incredulous eyes.

We read the legend that it lights :

“ Why should throughout this land of historied rights
Mild creatures, despot-doomed, bewildered, plead
Their often hunger, thirst, pangs, prisonment,
In deep dumb gaze more eloquent
Than tongues of widest heed?”

II.

What was faint-written, read in a breath
In that year—ten-times-ten away—
A larger clearer conscience saith
More sturdily to-day.

But still those innocents are thralls
To throbbless hearts, near, far, that hear no calls
Of honour towards their too-dependent frail;
And from Columbia Cape to Ind we see
How helplessness breeds tyranny
In power above assail.

III.

Cries still are heard in secret nooks,
Till hushed with gag or slit or thud;
And hideous dens whereon none looks
Are blotched with needless blood.
But here, in battlings, patient, slow,
Much has been won—more, maybe, than we know—
And on we labour stressful. “Ailnon!”
A mighty voice calls: “But may the good prevail!”
And “Blessed are the merciful!”
Calls yet a mightier one.

January 22, 1924.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD. BY H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES (PRESIDENT OF THE R.S.P.C.A.) -	vii
INTRODUCTION. BY LORD LAMBOURNE, C.V.O. (CHAIRMAN, R.S.P.C.A.) - - -	ix
COMPASSION: AN ODE. BY THOMAS HARDY, O.M. - - - - -	xv
 CHAPTER	
I. SOWING THE SEED - - - -	1
II. RICHARD MARTIN AND HIS ACT - -	27
III. THE FOUNDER OF THE SOCIETY - -	49
IV. EARLY DIFFICULTIES AND VICTORIES -	65
V. BULL-BAITING, COCK-FIGHTING, ETC. -	75
VI. THE ROYAL FAMILY AND THE SOCIETY -	83
VII. THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO DOGS -	104
VIII. LEARNING TO BE HUMANE - - -	127
IX. ANIMALS AND THE LAW - - - -	139
X. THE CHILDREN'S BRANCHES OF THE SOCIETY	159
XI. THE HUMANE SLAUGHTER OF ANIMALS -	173
XII. THE SOCIETY AND VIVISECTION - -	191
XIII. THE SOCIETY AND THE GREAT WAR - -	204
XIV. THE GROWTH OF THE WORK IN OTHER COUNTRIES - - - -	225
XV. SOME REFORMS STILL IN THE MAKING -	239
XVI. AFTER ONE HUNDRED YEARS - - -	276
 APPENDIX - - - - -	 291
 INDEX - - - - -	 293

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

	FACING PAGE
RICHARD MARTIN, M.P. - - - <i>Frontispiece</i> <i>From the picture presented to the R.S.P.C.A. by</i> <i>Mrs. Mary Ratcliffe Chambers.</i>	
LORD ERSKINE, LORD CHANCELLOR - - - <i>From the picture at the Society's headquarters.,</i>	22
THE BARONESS BURDETT-COUTTS - - -	22
JACCO MACCACCO, THE FIGHTING MONKEY - - - <i>From an old colour print.</i>	28
COCK-FIGHTING - - - - - <i>From an old colour print.</i>	28
BULL-BAITING - - - - - <i>From an old colour print.</i>	76
BEAR-BAITING - - - - - <i>From an old colour print.</i>	76
QUEEN VICTORIA AND PRINCESS BEATRICE WITH THEIR FAVOURITE DOGS - - - <i>Presented by Her Majesty to the Society.</i>	94
THE QUEEN'S MEDAL - - - - -	94
THE R.S.P.C.A. SICK AND WOUNDED WAR HORSES FUND : ONE OF THE FORTY MOTOR AMBULANCES PRESENTED BY THE R.S.P.C.A. IN ACTUAL USE	212
A VIEW OF ONE OF THE DEPÔTS FOR CONVALESCENT HORSES - - - - -	212

"PRINCE," THE DOG THAT FOUND ITS WAY FROM HAMMERSMITH TO THE TRENCHES NEAR ARMEN- TIÈRES - - - - -	222
<i>From the picture by Mrs. G. Shaw-Baker.</i>	
MESSENGER DOG USED DURING THE WAR -	222
A FUNERAL PLUME - - - - -	242
ONE OF THE VICTIMS OF THE WORN-OUT HORSE TRAFFIC - - - - -	242

A CENTURY OF WORK FOR ANIMALS

THE HISTORY OF THE R.S.P.C.A.

1824-1924

CHAPTER I

SOWING THE SEED

QUESTIONS jump to the mind when one thinks of the sufferings endured by animals in Great Britain before there was any law for their protection.

Were there no humanitarians in those days to teach people to be kind to animals? Was the Bible never read? How was it that our ancestors did not regard brutality to animals as bad form? Is it possible that Englishmen were ever naturally cruel to animals? How was it that until the latter half of the eighteenth century nobody thought of bringing about any practical reform for the benefit of animals?

And so on. The list of questions could easily be extended.

We must find some kind of excuse for our ancestors, and we plead on their behalf ignorance, chiefly due to thoughtlessness, lack of instruction, and a lack of sensitive feeling even for themselves and their children. Such indifference is still to be found among uncivilized races. Our ancestors were as untaught

children. A child who has never been taught to be kind to animals will pull a fly to pieces with the utmost unconcern; in a few years the same child, having learned that animals are entitled to decent treatment, remembers with shame its childish cruelty to the fly.

The mind of a nation is of slower growth than the mind of the individual. Our ancestors were blind to the sufferings of animals because they had never been taught to see them, and although at first the early humanitarians were either laughed at or ignored, they soon found that the bulk of the people were willing enough to reform themselves. It must be remembered that people had been cruel to animals for hundreds of years before anyone came forward to preach the gospel of kindness, and, though much remains still to be done, it has not taken this country one hundred years to change the customs of centuries and to earn a worldwide reputation of being an animal-loving nation, extremely kind to all animals.

It may be argued that the people of this country could never have been totally ignorant of the duty of being kind to animals, because many of them kept pet animals; that custom dates from the earliest times, and is, after all, almost universal. Unfortunately, it does not follow that a man who keeps a pet animal will necessarily be kind to other animals, or even to his own. In the nature of things he should be, but in this matter men and women are strangely inconsistent. A Londoner who will be indignant with anyone who has molested one of the Trafalgar Square pigeons will think nothing of the cruelty of keeping a wild bird in a small cage—if it happens to be his bird and he imagines that he enjoys its companion-

ship and its song. Similarly, a woman who would be distressed at the sight of a man whipping a horse unmercifully will complacently wear furs at the cost of great cruelty to the original owners of those furs.

Possibly we inherit this trait—inconsistency—from our ancestors. In olden times even kindly women took pleasure in watching the baiting of bulls and bears, and those were by no means the most brutal of the “sports” in which animals were used. Birds were—and are still—kept in cages much too small for them; squirrels were housed in the abominable wheel cages still seen occasionally to-day, and so on. But any kindness shown to pet animals in those days was more than cancelled by the brutality inflicted on other animals. We can easily imagine, for instance, how animals were generally treated at the time when an English Judge thought it necessary to put these lines on paper :

“I have ever thought that there is a certain degree of justice due to the creatures, as well as from man to man, and that an excessive use of the creatures’ labour is an injustice for which he must account. I have therefore esteemed it a part of my duty, and it has invariably been my practice, to be merciful to my beasts; and upon the same account I have declined all cruelty to any of God’s creatures, and when I have had the power I have prevented it in others.”

Those were the views of Sir Matthew Hale, Lord Chief Justice in the reign of Charles II.

Protests against cruelty made by the early humanitarians must have fallen on very deaf ears. Pepys was evidently a humanitarian before his time, for in his diary of August 4, 1666, he refers to a bull-baiting

he saw in Southwark as "a very rude and nasty pleasure"; and he adds that one of the dogs was tossed "into the very boxes."

The baiting of a horse had no attraction for another famous diarist—Evelyn—who tells us that he would not be persuaded to be a spectator. In his diary for June 16, 1670, is this :

"I went with some friends to the Bear Garden, where was cock-fighting, dog-fighting, and bear and bull baiting. . . . One of the bulls tossed a dog full into a lady's lap, as she sate in one of the boxes at a considerable height from the arena. Two poor dogs were killed, and so all ended with the ape on horse-back, and I most heartily weary of the rude and dirty creatures."

John Locke saw the necessity of teaching people to be kind. In his "Thoughts on Education," published towards the close of the seventeenth century, he said : "Children should from the beginning be bred up in an abhorrence of killing and tormenting any living creature. . . . And indeed, I think people from their cradles should be tender to all sensible creatures."

Some of the thinkers of the eighteenth century seem to have concerned themselves more about the souls of animals than about their bodies. Bishop Butler and John Wesley, who did not see eye to eye in other matters, were at one in believing that animals have souls.

"Neither can we find anything in the whole analogy of Nature," wrote Bishop Butler in his "Analogy of Religion," "to afford even the slightest presumption that animals ever lose their living powers, much less that they lose them by death. . . ." John Wesley

said the same thing in a sermon he preached on "The Great Deliverance": "Something better remains after death for these poor creatures also. . . ."

This doctrine was the theme of a book, "Free Thoughts upon the Brute Creation," by Dr. Hildrup, published in 1742. But at this period, no protest against cruelty to animals was more effective than that put forward by Hogarth, who, in his "Four Stages of Cruelty," taught the truth that brutality to animals leads to brutality to one's fellow-creatures. "If," said Hogarth, "my pictures have the effect of checking cruelty to dumb animals I am more proud of having been their author than I should be of having painted Raphael's cartoons."

The first suggestion that animals should have legal protection seems to have been made by an anonymous writer of an article in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, in 1749, in which he denounced the brutal sport of "cock-throwing." The sport consisted of throwing sticks at a fowl tied to a post until the bird was fatally injured, and to make the game last the longer the bird's feathers were sometimes greased so that the sticks would glance off its back. This was a favourite amusement of the people at Shrovetide, and the article entitled "Speech of a Hen on Shrove Tuesday" begins in the form of a report of something which had actually happened:

"This poor hen, after many a severe bang, and many a broken bone, weltering in mire and blood, recovered spirits a little, and to the unspeakable surprise and astonishment of all the company, just as her late master was handling his oaken cudgel to fling at her again. . . ."

And then the hen is supposed to speak. She pleads

with the company for kinder treatment, and concludes :

“ Perhaps the legislature may not think it beneath them to take our sad case into consideration.” Alas ! the legislature did nothing for animals until 1822, and birds were not protected by law until 1835.

“ An Essay on the Future Life of Brute Creatures,” by the Rev. Richard Dean, Curate of Middleton, was published in 1768. At the conclusion of his arguments, into which we need not enter, the author exhorts his readers to be more humane to animals and not to “ treat them as stocks, or stones, or things that cannot feel.” He gives us this picture of suffering animals :

“ Cruelty is exercised in all its hideous forms and varieties. Brutes are every day perishing under the hands of barbarity, without notice, without mercy ; famished as if hunger was no evil, mauled as if they had no sense of pain, and hurried about incessantly from day to day, as if excessive toil was no plague, or extreme weariness was no degree of suffering. Surely this principle of sensibility in brutes entitles them to a milder treatment than they usually meet from hard and unthinking wretches. . . .”

This author must have been one of the first men to give a thought to the sufferings of animals slaughtered for food, for he writes prophetically : “ Since from the nature and exigencies of the times, it is expedient that brutes should be killed, their lives therefore ought to be taken from them in the easiest and shortest manner possible. Humanity feels this truth, and men of the cruellest dispositions will some time or another be forced to confess it.”

But, in those days, to write about the duty of being

kind to animals was one thing; to plead the cause of animals from the pulpit was quite another thing, as the preacher of the first sermon on this subject discovered.

The preacher was the Rev. James Granger, Vicar of Shiplake, Oxfordshire, and he delivered his sermon on October 18, 1772. He published the sermon afterwards under the title: "An Apology for the Brute Creation, or Abuse of Animals Censured." (It will be noticed that the early humanitarians were fond of describing animals as "brutes.")

The sermon is dedicated to "T. B. Drayman," and the following note is printed on the title-page:

"This Discourse is not only intended for such as have the care of horses, and other useful Beasts; but also for Children, and those that are concerned in forming their Hearts."

From the delightfully quaint dedication we gather that this humane clergyman was a humorist.

"To T. B. Drayman.

"NEIGHBOUR TOM,

"Having seen thee exercise the lash with greater rage, and heard thee swear, at the same time, more roundly and forcibly than I ever saw, or heard, any of thy brethren of the whip in London, I cannot help thinking that thou hast the best right to this discourse. But I am afraid, Tom, that I shall, in some parts of it, appear to thee to be as great a Barbarian as thou seemest to me a Savage. If thou findest any hard words in it, come to my Vicarage house, and I will endeavour to explain them to thee in as familiar a language as thou talkest to thy horses.

"For God's sake and thy own, have some com-

passion upon these poor beasts; and especially the fore-horse of thy team. He is as sensible of blows as thou art; and ought not to have been so outrageously punished for turning aside into a road to which he was long accustomed, when thou wast fast asleep upon thy dray. If thou breakest any more whips about him, and repeatest thy horrid oaths, wishing thyself 'damned and double damned' if thou are not revenged of him, I shall take care that thou be punished by a Justice of the Peace, as well as thy own master, in this world; and give thee fair warning, that a worse punishment waits for thee in the next; and that damnation will certainly come, according to thy call.

"I, however, hope better things of thee; and that all thy punishment will be in this life. It is not likely that thy soul when separated from thy body will sleep till the day of judgment; according to the doctrine of a very sensible man, it may inhabit the fore-horse of a dray, and suffer all the pain that guilt and whipcord can give. In a word, Tom, I advise thee to fall upon thy knees, and ask God forgiveness for thy cruelty and thy oaths; and to be careful for the future not to sleep upon the road; to drink less ale, and no drams, so shalt thou save thy whips and thy horses, thy body and thy soul.

"I am, Tom,

"Thy Friend and Well-wisher,

"JAMES GRANGER."

A postscript tells us how the sermon was received :

"The foregoing discourse gave almost universal disgust to two considerable congregations. The

mention of dogs and horses was censured as a prostitution of the dignity of the pulpit, and considered as a proof of the author's insanity. It was written in great haste, of which, indeed, it carries the marks; but it was dictated from the heart.

"It is with great humility submitted to the judgment and candour of the public, and particularly to the cool consideration of those who were pleased to censure it, and by whose disapprobation without any premeditated design of the author, it now sees the light."

The text of this sermon was Proverbs xii., 10, "A righteous man regardeth the life of his beast," and yet the subject of the discourse—humanity to animals—was startlingly new.

"It is strange that beasts," says the preacher, "especially those of the most useful kind, that do so much good for, and suffer so much from man, have never, at least to my knowledge, had an advocate from the pulpit, although they have so just and urgent a claim to it, and cannot speak for themselves."

From this we may fairly infer that the clergy had overlooked the subject, and that fact is certainly "strange," as the preacher suggested. Although many thousands of sermons on kindness to animals have since been preached, the subject is not a popular one with the clergy even in our own time; yet it will be remembered that many of the Early Christian Fathers and Saints, and before them many of the great pagan philosophers, held close communion with animals and so learned to appreciate them, care for them, and protect them.

Extracts from this first sermon on kindness to

animals tell us something of the way in which animals were treated towards the close of the eighteenth century.

“It hath been observed that there is no country upon the face of the whole earth that is not totally sunk in barbarism where this beast (the horse) is so ill-treated, as it is in our own; hence England is proverbially called ‘The Hell of Horses.’ Our humanity hath also, with great appearance of reason, been called in question by foreigners, on account of our barbarous custom of baiting and worrying animals, and especially that cruel and infamous sport still practised among us on Shrove Tuesday. . . .”

The preacher confesses himself “also obliged to say something of the dog, the servant, the companion and the friend of man. . . . How often is he taught to be fierce and cruel . . . how often is he kept short of food, exposed to intolerable hardships, and the most painful death, by him whom Providence designed for his feeder and protector?”

In 1776 there was published a book which, we believe, was the first book devoted entirely to teaching the duty of kindness to animals. This was “A Dissertation on the Duty of Mercy and Sin of Cruelty to Brute Animals,” by Dr. Humphrey Primatt. All lovers of animals should remember the name of that author with gratitude, because, as we shall presently show, Dr. Primatt’s book may be regarded as the foundation-stone of this Society; the founder of the Society was greatly influenced by its teaching.

Dr. Primatt gives us a hint of the reform that was gradually to be brought about.

“It does not become any man to dictate to his superiors, but I cannot help sometimes supposing,

that if all the barbarous customs and practices still subsisting amongst us, were decreed to be as illegal as they are sinful, we should not hear of so many shocking murders and acts of inhumanity as we now do."

This prophecy is curiously borne out by a statement recently made by the General Superintendent of the Detective Association of America, who, after twenty-five years' experience, said: "Very few criminals are found who have been taught to love animals, and in searching for the cause of crime we find a lack of humane education is the probable one."

Was it a mere coincidence, we wonder, that in the same year that Dr. Primatt's book was published (1776) the City Marshal, a Mr. Millar, went into Smithfield Market, inspected the sticks in the hands of drovers and destroyed those which he considered to be of an improper size? He also warned the drovers to make use of more merciful weapons in future, and they promised to comply with his request.

It must be remembered that at that time there was no law in this country for the protection of animals. A man could do what he pleased with his own animal. A servant who injured one of his master's animals was liable to be prosecuted—not for cruelty to the animal, but for malicious injury to his master's property. The master had only to prove that his servant was actuated by malice.

Thus, on October 4, 1790, a man was prosecuted at Bow Street for tearing out the tongue of a horse. This offence was a little too brutal even for the people of those days. The newspaper report of the case describes the offence as one "at which humanity must shudder," and adds: "How completely de-

praved the mind of the man capable of committing an act of such cruelty as is alleged against the prisoner must be, may be deduced from the following relation. . . .”

The man had pulled the tongue out of the horse with his left hand, and “with more than brutal violence” had beaten the horse over the head with the butt end of a whip for upwards of ten minutes. The report concludes :

“The offence is capital, and if he should be found guilty we believe few will be found to repine at the punishment of such a wretch.” But as malice was not proved the “wretch” was acquitted.

Dr. Primatt was followed by Jeremy Bentham and other writers. Bentham was one of the first men to insist that acts of cruelty to animals must be classed among crimes cognizable by law. In his “Principles of Penal Law,” he wrote : “The legislator ought to interdict everything which may serve to lead to cruelty. . . . Why should the law refuse its protection to any sensitive being? The time will come when humanity will extend its mantle over everything which breathes. We have begun by attending to the condition of slaves ; we shall finish by softening that of all the animals which assist our labours or supply our wants.”

Bentham was a friend of Romilly.* “Love for pussies,” so Bentham declared, was their bond of

* Sir Samuel Romilly, the great criminal law reformer. His views on capital punishment were published in a book written in 1786 in reply to Madan’s “Thoughts on Executive Justice,” advocating the increase of capital punishments, but it was not until 1805 that Romilly attempted to give practical effect to his views. At that time a great many minor offences were punishable by death. Romilly had to work for many years before he secured recognition of his wisdom and humanity.

union, and he tells us that Romilly "kept a noble puss before he came into great business. I never failed to pay it my respects."

Foremost among other writers of the time who championed the cause of animals was John Lawrence, a farmer, but a farmer of a very rare kind. In 1796, Lawrence brought out a book on horses in which he called attention to the need of legal protection for animals. He mentions the case of two Manchester butchers who, in 1793, were fined twenty shillings each for cutting off the feet of live sheep and driving them through the streets.

"Had the sheep been their own property," says Lawrence, "they might, with impunity, either have dissected them alive or burned them alive."

Ignorance of the needs of animals is often the cause of cruelty to animals, even in these days. Lawrence tells us that many of the people of Ireland and Scotland "obliged their horses to draw by the tail, and took ages to be convinced that it was more convenient to do it with their shoulders."

This author foresaw the difficulty of making legal and formal recognition of the rights of beasts. "You cannot punish cruelty and aggression without trespassing upon the rights of property."

Lawrence was far ahead of his time. He recognized the importance of humane education for the young, and pleaded "with people of property to take at least their own animals under their own especial protection, to suffer no abuse, but to punish the brutal tyranny of profligate servants in the most exemplary manner."

On one occasion Lawrence tried to reason with a man who was beating a horse "until the blood spun from its nostrils." The man retorted :

“G——d—— my eyes, Jack, you are talking as if the horse was a Christian.”

He describes a case of cruelty he saw in 1762. A housekeeper of a boarding-school caused a rat to be roasted alive over a slow fire in the presence of the boys, “and this I was then informed was the constant practice of a certain postmaster in the neighbourhood.”

The author knew his public. He tells us that he has been “by no means unmindful . . . of the censure and ridicule to which I am exposing myself for the indolent, the prejudiced, and the hard-hearted.”

Lawrence lived long enough to see a change in the attitude of the public towards animals; and he had the pleasure of becoming one of the first members of the S.P.C.A.

In 1798, Thomas Young, a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, published “An Essay on Humanity to Animals,” in which he dealt with many kinds of cruelty, from the torturing of flies and butterflies to bull-baiting, cock-fighting and throwing at cocks, nailing down fowls by their feet “in order to cram them more conveniently,” the crimping of fish—*i.e.*, “cutting them into pieces whilst they are alive, and frying the pieces yet stirring with life”—bird’s-nesting, killing bees to take their honey, docking, cropping dogs’ ears, the stripping of geese (plucking them while they are alive), the caging of wild birds, and the cruelties involved in the performances of trained animals. Young must surely have been the first man to protest in print against performing animals.

“I am of opinion,” he says, “that a cultivated

mind will receive little pleasure from the sight of animals taught to mimic actions. . . . I would sooner venture to affirm that no species whatever of animals is ugly, than to profess that I should have been much gratified with the performances of the learned pig. When I reflect upon the cruelty which must necessarily be used in order to produce these artificial monsters, I am still further confirmed in the above opinion. It is said in particular that bears are first taught to dance by placing them upon an heated floor, and playing some tune to them in the meantime. Magistrates have the power to prevent persons from travelling about the country with shows of the above description; and by a proper exertion of it they would do much good, besides cutting off one source of cruelty to animals."

That was written in 1798; at the time of writing Parliament is considering a half-hearted measure for the benefit of performing animals. Progress is sometimes very slow.

An abridged edition of Young's book was afterwards brought out by an anonymous writer, who says that he applied to "the respectable author" for permission to publish an abridgment of his valuable work for the sole purpose of giving it away.

The duty of being kind to animals was pointed out to young people by other writers at the close of the eighteenth century. Mrs. Trimmer's "History of the Robins," published in 1786, was one of the nursery classics of its time. Soon afterwards, Mary Wollstonecraft published the "Elements of Morality," for the use of children, and her "Moral Conversations and Stories."

And so the eighteenth century closed as it had

begun—so far as the treatment of animals was concerned—with suggestions and entreaties for reforms.

But words were soon to be translated into deeds.

The first attempt at legislation for the protection of animals was made in April, 1800, when Sir W. Pulteney introduced a Bill to stop bull-baiting.

The early humanitarians were certainly courageous in beginning their campaign against cruelty to animals by trying to suppress this sport, which had been one of the favourite amusements of the people since the reign of Henry II. At one time there was scarcely a town or village of any magnitude which had not its bull-ring, and butchers were forbidden by law to kill a bull until it had been baited. Queen Elizabeth was specially fond of the sport, and even the clergy, at one time, took pleasure in witnessing the spectacle of a bull, tied to a stake, being tormented by dogs.*

Thomas Cartwright, in his "Admonition to Parliament against the use of the Common Prayer," published in 1572, says: "If there be a bear or a bull to be baited in the afternoon, or a jackanapes to ride on horseback, the minister hurries the service over in a shameful manner, in order to be present at the show."

When the first humane measure was introduced, the sport had fallen into disrepute and was generally regarded as one of the amusements of the lowest of the people. Still, those who wished to abolish bull-baiting laid themselves open to the charge of interfering with the amusements of the people, and the opponents of the reform took every opportunity of

* Strutt's "Sports and Pastimes."

using that argument, which still does service nowadays when other forms of cruelty are attacked.

Among the supporters of the reform was Sheridan,* who said that he would be happy to concur in any plan for extending the enjoyments of the poor, but he was confident that bull-baiting was the source of wretchedness to them. Instead of giving the poor bull-baiting, he would give them beef. Sheridan added that an honourable friend of his intended shortly to bring in a Bill for preventing inhumanity to animals in general, "especially the horses, which are seen every day in our streets treated with the most vicious and unmerciful cruelty."

Windham,† in opposing the Bill, said he could not see any necessity whatever for the interference of the

* Richard Brinsley Sheridan, the dramatist. He was in Parliament from 1780 to 1812. His love of dogs was indicated in an amusing speech he made in opposing the passing of a Dog Tax Bill in 1796. Sheridan pointed out that the Bill was most curiously worded, as it was in the first instance entitled "A Bill for the protection of His Majesty's subjects against dogs." From these words, he said, one would imagine that dogs had been guilty of burglary, though he believed they were a better protection to their masters' property than watchmen. The next charge brought against "these poor animals," as injuring His Majesty's subjects, was canine madness. He had heard of an instance of canine madness, which was a truly ridiculous one. A dog had bit a hog, and the hog barked like a dog; the dog had bit the farmer, and the farmer grunted like a hog; lastly, the farmer bit one of his own cows, and the cow attempted to speak like the farmer. He thought that the inhumanity of the measure was ill-timed. Sheridan's amendment postponing further consideration of the Bill was carried without a division.

† William Windham, a member of an ancient family of Felbrigg, near Cromer, was Secretary for War. His active opposition to all efforts to suppress bull-baiting and to Sir Samuel Romilly's measures for reducing the number of offences punishable by death, suggests that there may be a close relationship between inhumanity to animals and indifference to the feelings of human beings.

Legislature in order to diminish bull-baiting. Canning* said there was no occasion for passing an Act to render bull-baiting penal. He considered that the amusement was a most excellent one. It inspired courage and produced a nobleness of sentiment and elevation of mind. . . . Putting a stop to bull-baiting was legislating against the spirit and genius of almost every country and age.

The Bill was lost, and two years passed before a second attempt was made to put down bull-baiting.

William Wilberforce,† whose love of animals was as ardent as his sympathy for human slaves, made a long speech in support of the second Bill. He said he thought the subject had been treated with too much levity. If the good effects attributed to bull-baiting were really produced by it, why not move to have it rendered more general? He was certain that if any member had inquired into the subject minutely he would no longer defend the practice, which degraded human nature to a level with the brutes. When bulls were bought merely for the purpose of being baited, the people who bought them wished to have as much

* George Canning, afterwards Foreign Secretary, and, in 1827, Premier.

† It is interesting to remember that the great reform with which Wilberforce's name will ever be associated—the abolition of the slave trade—was first advocated by him in 1787, and that in spite of his labours in and out of the House of Commons he met with no success until 1807. Since this reform for the benefit of human beings was twenty years in the making, one is not surprised that a period of twenty-two years elapsed between the first attempt to secure legislation for the protection of animals and the passing of the first Act for the prevention of cruelty to them. Wilberforce's great work for slaves has rather overshadowed his many efforts to improve the social conditions of people at home. He was a man of wide sympathies and took an active part in the early work of the R.S.P.C.A. He was present at the inaugural meeting of the Society.

diversion (if diversion such cruelty could be called) as possible for their money. The consequence was that every art, even fire, was employed to rouse the exhausted animals to further exertion, and there were instances where he had expired in protracted agonies amidst the flames. It had been stated that it would be wrong to deprive the lower orders of their amusements. Wretched, indeed, must be the condition of the people of England if their whole happiness consisted in the practice of such barbarity.

Sheridan, in supporting the Bill, said he was convinced that bull-baiting was the most mischievous of all amusements and most calculated to brutalize people's manners. It had been argued that bull-baiting was not adopted for the sake of the cruelty ; but he saw no difference that could arise from the motive introduced to excuse this diabolical amusement (as it was called) and he must consider cruelty to brute animals a crime, whether done for amusement, for sport, or for gluttony ; and therefore if there were not laws to prevent, if not to punish, such cruelties, there certainly ought to be. He added : " And if gentlemen who oppose the Bill do not find themselves in a small minority it will, in my opinion, be a disgrace to the House."

This second attempt at legislation for animals failed. *The Times*, commenting on the fate of the Bill, said that they agreed with Mr. Windham that the subject of bull-baiting was not at any time suited to the dignity of Parliament as a solitary object of discussion, but they pointed out that a bull-baiting never fails to be a " scene of riot as well as barbarity."

At the next election, Windham, who came from an old Norfolk family and represented Norwich in Par-

liament, was unseated. There were other members of famous Norfolk families—notably the Gurneys and the Buxtons—whose views on the subject of cruelty to animals were in harmony with those who wished to put down bull-baiting, and the electors of Norwich declined to be represented in Parliament by an advocate of that barbarous amusement.

In 1802, the year in which this second attempt to stop bull-baiting had failed, there was published a short tract entitled “A Remonstrance against Inhumanity to Animals and Particularly Against the Savage Practice of Bull-baiting.”

The tract was published at Alnwick, and was dedicated to “The Parliamentary electors of the City of Norwich as a small but sincere tribute to their spirit of independence and humanity.”

The author says in his preface that “since the Bill against bull-baiting was thrown out of the House of Commons that crime has been more frequent, and it has been committed with additional and more ingenious barbarity.”

“Not long ago, at Bury, in Lancashire . . . those diabolical wretches the bull-baiters cut off the feet of their victim.

“At Chester, they sawed through his horns to the quick; to heighten the entertainment which they were to receive, from intolerable anguish and ineffectual rage. . . .

“At Beverley, they blew off great quantities of gunpowder close to the face of the expiring bull.”

These cases, bad as they were, were not more barbarous than that of a bull-baiting advertised in the *Weekly Journal* of 1730. The baiting was held at “His Majesty’s Bear Garden,” Clerkenwell.

“A mad bull, dressed up with fireworks, is to be turned loose in the same place; likewise a dog dressed up with fireworks; also a bear to be turned loose. N.B.—A cat to be tied to the bull’s tail.”

The author of this tract against bull-baiting says that “the most splendid talents in the House of Commons, however they were unfortunately divided on other subjects, were gloriously united in the cause of humanity, against the vilest of mankind—bull-baiters and slave-holders. A stupid or absurd head is always the companion of an unfeeling heart.”

It is interesting to note that Scotland was totally free from bull-baiting, but Ireland was as notorious for it as England.

In 1805, a Mr. Dent gave notice that he should on an early day next session move for leave to bring in a Bill for putting a stop to the practice of bull-baiting. There is no further reference in Hansard or the papers to this Bill.

It has been said that English people did not begin to be kind to animals until they had learned to be kind to one another. In the early part of the nineteenth century, some humanitarians were at work for the benefit of animals; others for human beings. The men who were working for their fellow-creatures happened to be more successful than those who were trying to secure laws for the protection of animals, but the order of events might easily have been reversed. The same spirit of humanity which animated William Wilberforce, in his efforts to abolish slavery, and Sir Samuel Romilly, in his work for reforming our criminal law, also inspired Lord Erskine to bring in a Bill to the House of Lords to prevent cruelty to animals. Wilberforce’s Anti-

Slavery Bill was not passed until 1807, and it was not until the following year that Sir Samuel Romilly carried through the Commons a Bill, afterwards agreed to by the Lords, for repealing the punishment of death for picking pockets.

In 1809, Lord Erskine,* Lord High Chancellor of England, introduced in the Lords a Bill for "Preventing Wanton and Malicious Cruelty to Animals." The second reading, on May 15, was made memorable by Lord Erskine's speech on behalf of animals.

"Animals," he said, "are considered only as property; to destroy or abuse them from malice to the proprietor, or with an intention injurious to his interests in them, is criminal; but the animals themselves are without protection. The law regards them not substantively; they have no rights." Lord Erskine concluded by saying that if the Bill received the sanction of Parliament it would not only be an honour to the country, but an "era in the history of the world."

Lord Erskine's speech attracted much attention, and it was afterwards published in pamphlet form.

The Bill passed through the Lords, but met with much opposition in the Commons, and eventually it was lost. *The Times*, in an article on the Bill, said: "We cannot conclude without bestowing our humble approbation upon the author of the Bill, and expressing our opinion that it is peculiarly worthy of him, whose talents have been so happily exercised in defending the rights of his fellow-subjects, thus to lay the foundation for and establish a system of rights

* It is interesting to note that the present Lord Erskine, grandson of the one who introduced this Bill, is the President of the Northamptonshire Branch of the Society.



THE BARONESS BURDETT-COUTTS.

(See p. 135.)



LORD ERSKINE, LORD CHANCELLOR.

From the picture at the Society's Headquarters.

and privileges even for the mute and unconscious part of creation."

The *Edinburgh Review*, with reference to the Bill, wrote: "No reason can be assigned for the interference of legislation in the protection of animals *unless their protection be connected either directly or remotely with some advantage to man.*"* Thank God times have changed, and no magazine or paper of to-day would dare to make such a claim!

Within a few months of the rejection of Lord Erskine's Bill, the first society for preventing cruelty to animals was established in Liverpool. The society was called the Society for the Suppression of Wanton Cruelty to Animals, but it was short-lived. Probably the supporters of the society soon discovered that without the aid of the law one cannot suppress cruelty to animals, and the country was without that law.

In the following year, Lord Erskine presented another Bill, which, he said, was the same as his first Bill, but with an additional clause to overcome the objection that a man might be liable to all the punishments imposed by the Bill for a mere act of sudden passion.

At the second reading of the Bill, Lord Ellenborough declared that if the Bill passed as it then stood, it would cause more vexation to mankind than was now suffered by the brute creation. He argued that the moral sense of mankind was sufficient, as it hitherto had been, for the protection of animals. This "leaving well alone" attitude has been adopted by opponents of reforms in all ages. But, though Lord Erskine had eventually to withdraw his Bill, he practised what he preached. Noticing an overloaded

* The italics are our own.

and underfed horse in Coventry Street, he offered the driver a guinea if he would part with the horse. The man replied that he could work the horse for three weeks longer and then sell him to the slaughter-house for from £4 to £5. Lord Erskine saved the horse from three weeks of misery by buying the animal himself.

In 1816, the Attorney-General, Sir William Garrow, moved for leave to bring in the "Stage Coaches Bill," the object of which was not so much to prevent cruelty to animals as to protect the lives and limbs of His Majesty's subjects. The Lords rejected the Bill. Lord Lauderdale declared that no persons would agree as to what was and what was not over driving.

The need for starting a society for the prevention of cruelty to animals was undoubtedly in the minds of some of the humanitarians of this period. A letter from an anonymous correspondent appeared in the *Monthly Magazine* for December, 1820, suggesting the formation of such a society, and in the following issue of the magazine another anonymous correspondent encouraged the idea and gave a little glimpse into the life of the period.

"Sure I am that some gross mismanagement must have taken place in the education of the late Mr. A., of Hampstead, or he could not have ordered a game fowl to be roasted alive because it had refused to fight another animal of the some kind at a cock-fight."

In the *Monthly Magazine* of April, 1821, there appeared the following paragraph, which was probably written by the Rev. Arthur Broome, founder of the Society. It was signed "Clericus."

"An individual, actuated by a compassionate regard for the sufferings of the brute species, and

lamenting, in common with every feeling mind, the wanton cruelties which are so frequently exercised with impunity on this unoffending part of God's creatures, earnestly appeals to the public in their behalf."

He suggested the formation of a society, "by whose united exertions some check may, if practicable, be applied to an evil which disgraces the country, and is equally repugnant to the dictates of humanity, and to the benevolent spirit and precepts of the Christian religion."

John Lawrence replied in the next number welcoming the suggestion of forming societies for the protection of animals. Lawrence was a friend of Richard Martin, the warm-hearted Irishman destined to succeed where Lord Erskine had failed. There can be little doubt that these two humane men discussed together the formation of a society for preventing cruelty to animals and concluded that such a society would be of little use until there was a law for the protection of animals.

In 1821, Richard Martin brought in a Bill to prevent the ill-treatment of horses and other animals; the Commons laughed at Martin.

The suggestion of a Member that asses should also be protected from cruelty was greeted with laughter, and when Martin went on to show the humanity and necessity of affording protection to asses, the laughter was so loud that *The Times* reporter could not hear him. *The Times* adds that loud laughter followed the amendment that the word "ass" should be inserted in the Bill, and the laughter increased when the amendment was put by the Chairman.

One Member suggested that if a Bill for the pro-

tection of horses and asses were passed, he should not be surprised to find some other Member proposing a Bill for the protection of dogs.

“And cats,” came from another Member.

The Bill passed through the Commons, but, in spite of many petitions in its favour presented in the Lords, the Bill was lost there. A curious objection to the Bill was raised by Lord Lauderdale, who pointed out that all the petitions were against cruelty in general, whereas this Bill would prevent cruelty to only one animal—the horse. He opposed the measure on the ground that the subject was not a fit one for legislation.

During the time that this Bill was in progress, an Extra Post Bill was brought forward, to legalize a higher rate of speed for mail coaches. Sir W. de Crespigny opposed the Bill on the ground that it would sanction acts of cruelty to horses. The Bill was rejected.

We now come to the year 1822, a year memorable to all lovers of animals. Richard Martin's first attempt to secure legal protection for animals had come to nothing, but Martin was not the kind of man to be daunted by one failure. In 1822, he tried again, and, as everyone knows, Martin's Act, as it came to be known, the first law for the protection of animals, was put on the Statute Book in that year.

England had begun to be humane.

CHAPTER II

RICHARD MARTIN AND HIS ACT

How was it that Richard Martin succeeded where Lord Erskine and his predecessors had failed?

We can suggest but one answer to that question. Martin knew the mind of Parliament and the mind of the general public. Perhaps he gained his knowledge intuitively, but the conduct which he based upon it showed that his knowledge was sound. Martin was a very impulsive man, but he knew how to be patient. In 1800, he had supported the Bill for the suppression of bull-baiting, but he waited until 1821 before he introduced his first Bill for the prevention of cruelty to animals.

While the Bill was going through the Commons, Martin let the public know that he intended to do what he could out of Parliament to prevent cruelty to animals. And it is well to remember that at that time he was sixty-seven.

One newspaper of the day writes: "Lord Erskine tried to deliver the beasts from their bondage, but he completely failed. Mr. Martin's success shows the superiority of genius over learning.

"Mr. Martin is not a very learned man, neither is he, in the language of the schools, eloquent, but he has a most winning way with him. He holds the House by the very test of the human race, laughter, and while their sides shake, their opposition is shaken and falls down at the same instant.

“There is a beautiful symmetry, a perfect keeping, as it were, in the whole man of Richard Martin, Esq., every limb of his body and every feature of his face is round and solid. He lets drive at the House like a bullet, and the flag of truce is instantly flung out upon both sides.”

On June 16, 1821, Martin appeared at the Guildhall Police Court to substantiate charges against two men for cruelty to a horse. There appeared to be some doubt as to how far the magistrate was authorized to punish for this offence, and at the desire of Martin one prisoner was allowed to go. A warrant was issued for the arrest of the other man who had failed to appear.

Martin's first Bill had been lost in the Lords. In 1822, he tried again. The new Bill was not a watered down edition of the unsuccessful Bill of 1821, but was as comprehensive as its author dared make it. Soon after he introduced it, Martin presented a petition from the inhabitants of Camberwell, praying that the House would adopt some measure for protecting brute animals from cruelty.

At the first reading of his Bill, Martin described the “Westminster Pit,” where fights between various animals took place. Martin's reading of a printed notice of one of these fights was greeted with laughter. The notice was :

“Jacco Maccacco, the celebrated monkey, will this day fight Tom Crib's white bitch, Puss. Jacco has fought many battles with some of the first dogs of the day and has beat them all, and he hereby offers to fight any dog in England of double his own weight.”

The battle advertised in that notice lasted for upwards of half an hour; by that time, both animals



COCK FIGHTING.

From an old colour print (see p. 79).



JACCO MACCACCIO, THE FIGHTING MONKEY.

From an old colour print.

were badly injured, and two hours afterwards they died.

The House laughed again at Martin's description of the fight. He went on to describe a visit he himself had paid to the Pit, where he saw a woman who belonged to it. The woman had just returned from hospital, where she had been for six months on account of a wound she had received from a bear. A bear and between fifty and sixty badgers were kept at the Pit.

During the second reading of the Bill, the Attorney-General opposed it, but Martin was ready with an effective reply. He told the Attorney-General that he had placed himself in opposition to the common sense of the whole nation. The magistrates of London and Middlesex had spoken in favour of the measure, and it had received the support of clergymen.

At the third reading, opposition came from Martin's own friends. They thought that the Bill was too vague, and they urged him to withdraw it and bring in an amended Bill. Martin declined to take their advice, and the Bill was passed. In the Lords it was supported by Lord Erskine; it was read a third time on July 18, and received the Royal Assent on July 22.

Martin had been patient at the right time, persistent at the right time, and now he was impulsive and indiscreet at the wrong time.

On the very day that his Bill received the Royal Assent, Martin went into the Press Gallery of the House of Commons and requested the reporter of *The Times* that he would never in future, upon any occasion, attribute a single syllable to him in his paper.

"I know," said Martin, "that when you choose,

you are able to do full justice to any gentleman that may speak, but somehow or other it happens that whenever I rise to address the House you take the opportunity of putting something foolish or ridiculous into my mouth. Now, I promise you, upon my word, that if I ever find myself in print again in your paper, I will complain of it to the House and bring to the bar all the parties concerned."

The reporter replied that Mr. Martin had never been intentionally misrepresented in *The Times*, and assured him that so far as he (the reporter) was concerned, Mr. Martin should never again appear in print. To that Mr. Martin (we quote *The Times*) smiled and said :

"I am glad to hear you say so. If you say any more of me than that Mr. R. Martin spoke, or Mr. R. Martin voted on such and such a subject—for you may say that, as I am not ashamed of my party—I will bring you before the House, depend upon it, and I will also put a stop to reporting altogether."

This, of course, was hardly the best way to start a great campaign for the prevention of cruelty to animals, but no doubt the Press Gallery knew their man.

Martin lost no time in putting his Act into operation. In less than three weeks after the Act had been passed, he brought the first case himself, and it was by no mere accident that he did so. Martin knew where an offender would be likely to be found, and he went out himself and found two offenders.

That *The Times* had not forgotten Martin's smiling warning to its Gallery reporter is shown by the report of this case in the issue of August 12, 1822. The report begins :

“Although the honourable member for Galway (Mr. Martin) has interdicted the reporting of his speeches, we shall not, we presume, incur his displeasure by detailing his proceedings to prevent the late statute from remaining a dead letter. In furtherance of this laudable intention the honourable gentleman, it seems, took a turn into Smithfield, during the horse-market, on Friday evening and, in consequence, two men, who by his direction had been taken into custody by the officers for offences under this Act, were brought up on Saturday before Mr. Alderman Waithman.

“The first, who gave his name as Samuel Clarke, Mr. Martin said he had observed beating a horse in so cruel and violent a manner with a large whip, that the poor animal was completely wealed from its shoulder to its tail. The beast could have done nothing to merit such treatment, as he was standing quietly tied up to a rail. The barbarity of the prisoner was therefore most wanton and unprovoked.

“Clarke, who described himself as a horse-dealer, and said he brought the animal to market for sale, did in effect allow the truth of the charge against him. The horse, he said, was standing very sleepy and dull, and he acknowledged he did hit him a few times to make him show the appearance of a little spirit and life.

“The other prisoner, David Hyde, was charged with beating a horse, which he was riding to the market for sale, in a most cruel and wanton manner, over the head with the butt-end of his whip. This brutality seemed to be the result of the same motive as that of the other prisoner—namely, to make the animal carry a good appearance; for when the officers interfered, they found that the horse’s head was nearly

fixed in a certain position by a rope under the bridle; and whenever the animal swerved at all from the position, the fellow struck him violently with the whip in order to make him carry his head in the exact manner required.

"The fellow said he had beaten the horse to make it leave off kicking, and being asked what he was, said a butcher by trade.

" 'Yes,' observed Mr. Martin, 'I perceive that—a horse butcher.'

"The testimony of the honourable gentleman, as to the conduct of both the prisoners, was confirmed to the fullest extent by Worrall, the officer who took them into custody; and the two fellows were severally convicted by the mitigated penalty of 20s. each."

That was the first case decided by Martin's Act, and we mention it here because the report disposes of a tradition, long held by supporters of the Society, that the first case had to do with a costermonger who had ill-treated his donkey. It was said—though we have been unable to discover any report to substantiate the story—that, in order to prove his case against the costermonger, Martin obtained permission to have the ill-used donkey brought into court.

The unknown person who originated this story supported it by producing a picture of the scene in court with the donkey standing before the magistrate. We know that Martin conducted his cases in a most unconventional way, but we doubt if even he would have been allowed to call the donkey as witness, and we prefer to believe that the picture referred to a comic song which was published soon after Martin's Act became known. Possibly the song suggested the picture. We give the words :

If I had a donkey wot wouldn't go,
 D'ye think I'd wollop him? No, no, no!
 But gentle means I'd try, d'ye see,
 Because I hate all cruelty.
 If all had been like me, in fact,
 There ha' been no occasion for Martin's Act—
 Dumb animals to prevent getting crackt
 On the head.

For if I had a donkey wot wouldn't go
 I never would wollop him. No, no, no!
 I'd give him some hay, and cry “ Geeo Ho!”
 And “ Come up, Ned!”

Wot makes me mention this this morn,
 I seed that cruel chap, Bill Burn—
 Whilst he was out a-crying his greens—
 His donkey wollop with all his means.
 He hit him o'er his head and thighs,
 He brought the tears up in my eyes,
 At last my blood began to rise;
 And I said :

If I had a donkey, etc.

Bill turned and said to me : “ Then, perhaps,
 You're one of these Mr. Martin chaps,
 Wot now is seeking for occasion
 All for to lie an information.”
 Though this I stoutly did deny,
 Bill up and give me a blow in the eye.
 And I replied, as I let fly
 At his head :

If I had a donkey, etc.

As Bill and I did break the peace,
 To us came up the new Police,
 And hiked us off, as sure as fate,
 Afore the sitting magistrate.
 I told his worship all the spree,
 And for to prove the veracity,
 I wish'd he would the animal see.
 For I said :

If I had a donkey, etc.

Bill's donkey was ordered into court,
In which he caused a deal of sport;
He cock'd his ears, and ope'd his jaws,
As if he wished to plead his cause.
I prov'd I'd been uncommonly kind,
The ass got a verdict—Bill got fined;
For his worship and I were of one mind,
And he said :

If I had a donkey, etc.

Bill said : " Your worship, it's very hard,
But 't isn't the fine that I regard;
But times are come to a pretty pass
When you mustn't beat a stubborn ass."
His Worship said nothing, but shut his book;
So Billy off his donkey took,
The same time giving me such a look;
For I said :

Bill, if I had a donkey, etc.

It is interesting to note that in one respect Martin's Act was more effective than the one now in operation, for the minimum penalty under Martin's Act for cruelty to an animal was a fine of ten shillings, There is no such minimum in the present Act, and therefore magistrates have often exercised their power by inflicting penalties totally inadequate in comparison with the brutality of the crime.

On one occasion, soon after the passing of his Act, Martin charged a man with cruelty to a horse. By this time, Martin's championship of the rights of animals was well known to everyone, and this offender, probably fearing a heavy penalty, absconded. He was found and brought to the court, where he wept bitterly. The report of the case tells us that Martin's statement of the case was frequently interrupted by the " bellowing " of the prisoner. At each interruption Martin remarked :

“Hold your tongue, sirrah; it is the poor horse and not you that should cry.”

The man was fined ten shillings and eight shillings costs, and being unable to pay was committed to prison. Martin, with his well-known kindness of heart, wished to pay the fine himself, but the magistrate would not allow him to do so; whereupon Martin gave ten shillings to the officer who had served the warrant.

Martin frequently behaved in this way when he brought a case into court. Apparently he considered that a prosecution for cruelty to an animal was such a novelty to most offenders that they might be let off with a caution for the first offence. He was content if they learned their lesson.

Martin conducted his cases in his own breezy fashion. In one case, when the magistrate suggested that a man should be permitted to exercise his own judgment as to the extent of chastisement he might inflict on his horse, Martin retorted :

“Oh, by G——, if a man is to be the judge in his own case there is an end of everything.”

“I must fine you five shillings for swearing,” said the magistrate.

“I am sworn already,” replied Martin.

“Yes, but you have sworn an unnecessary oath.”

“Well, I’ll pay,” said Martin.

But the magistrate said he had been joking and remitted the fine.

The case proceeded, and in the end the magistrate said he was not authorized to convict in the circumstances.

And then Martin lost his temper.

“Time has been,” he said, “that when the brains

were out the man would die." He added that he thought the magistrate should be relieved from the labour of his situation, and that he (Martin) should move that all persons convicted for offences under the Act should be pardoned.

But, as a rule, Martin was most genial when he was conducting a case. Once, when he was prosecuting a man for overloading a horse, he admitted that he had no fault to find with the man, and added that, being sure that the defendant was a good fellow, he (Martin) would go forty miles at any time to give him a character.

"Here, my good fellow," said Martin, "you did everything that I could have done myself; there's a crown for you. I find no fault with you, but with your master for overloading the waggon, and if there is a conviction he must pay for it; but I was obliged to summon you, though all your fault in the business was consenting to let the horse try to draw such a load, and that, perhaps, you could not help, as you are only a servant."

The case was dismissed; the magistrate held that overloading a horse did not come within the meaning of the words of the statute—"beat, abuse, or ill-treat."

On another occasion, when Martin had summoned a man for cruelty to a horse, the owner, a Mr. Farnwell, came forward to give his servant a good character for humanity. He said he was a good-tempered man and had driven the same horse for nineteen years.

"Why, man alive," said Martin, "your wife told me a very different story when I called upon her. She said he was a very ill-tempered fellow."

Mr. Farnwell replied that his wife had referred to

the horse and not to the man. Martin at once appealed to the magistrate “whether the defendant does not bear the outward and visible signs of a bad temper. Anyone who knows anything about physiognomy can see that in a moment.”

The magistrate, Sir Richard Birnie, settled the matter by fining the defendant ten shillings and costs.

Soon afterwards, in an unofficial conversation with the magistrate, Martin used one of his favourite expressions.

“Pray, Mr. Martin,” said the magistrate, “do you not know that you are subject to a fine for swearing before a magistrate?”

“By G—— Birnie, you’re right,” said Martin, and at once paid the five shillings.

On another occasion, Martin summoned a coachman for brutally thrashing a horse over the ears, eyes and nose, and every part of the head. Martin said that if the man were his coachman, he would dismiss him from his service and “advertise him” in all the public papers. Martin and the coachman had a long argument, and Martin was asked what he would do with a kicking horse. He replied :

“The best way would be to whisper in the horse’s ear, ‘You are a good horse and I am a bad man.’” He added : “You are, my friend, a very devil of a coachman.”

The coachman replied : “I am better able to suit you, for you are the devil himself.”

The magistrate interrupted the argument, and fined the defendant ten shillings and costs.

At the first annual meeting of the Society in 1825, Martin, in a characteristic speech, humorously referred to his many unsuccessful attempts at legislation

for animals. "He rose," says the report, "amidst a tumult of applause."

"Somehow or other," said Martin, "my Bills were thrown out actually before they were brought in. The moment it was intimated that I intended to introduce the Bills, an outcry was raised against me. I was told that it was unreasonable to deprive the lower orders of their sports, while I left the sports of the higher classes untouched, and that I ought to have attacked equally the sports of hunting, fishing, shooting, etc.

"Now, although it is true enough that there is much cruelty in those gentlemanly sports (hear, hear) yet it is no reason to reject the attempt to put down a few acknowledged barbarities, because we can't put them all down. (Applause.) For my own part, I could wish to get rid of every one of them, good or bad. (Hear, hear.) But if I can't get 100 per cent., why, then, I must be satisfied to take 50 or 25 per cent. (Much laughter.)

"But I must say that it makes me blush, as a Member of Parliament, to be obliged to confess that the great indisposition to put an end to cruelty to animals exists in the House of Parliament itself. (Hear, hear.) I may truly say, that a greater love for, or, at least, adherence to, the principle of cruelty exists in St. Stephen's Chapel than in the Bear Garden itself. (Laughter.) In the House of Commons, containing six or seven hundred Members, I am sure there are ten to one against any measure to diminish the sufferings of the brute creation. (Hear, hear.)

"And, besides this, there is a regular set made against any Bill which I propose, so that I am sure to have a banded party against my Bills. (Hear, hear,

and laughter.) Nay, some of those gentlemen make it their honest boast that 'they never did, nor never would, support any of Mr. Martin's Acts.' (Much laughter.) There's the Member for Aberdeen, Mr. Joey Hume; he's one of 'em. (Laughter.) And there's another, Mr. Fyshe Palmer, who always volunteers to oppose my Bills. (Much laughter.) But, indeed, *he* is not nice in this matter, for he is equally opposed to every measure whatever where the interests of the human or the brute creation are concerned. (Much laughter.) He is now so notorious for it that a celebrated phrenologist has made a particular request to have a cast of his skull to observe the organ of destructiveness, which, he says, must be strongly developed. (Much laughter.)

"Now, I have no great opinion of Spurzheim's craniological reveries, but I really fancy something extraordinary must be in Mr. Palmer's skull, though, as far as his physiognomy goes, I cannot say I find anything particularly cruel in its features. (Much laughter). . . .

"I will now recommend to my honourable friend, the Chairman, to introduce a Bill himself next Session, for, so surely as I make the attempt, I shall be foiled. There is a regular conspiracy against every measure with which I am supposed to have anything to do."

The Act of 1822 was the only measure which Martin succeeded in getting on to the Statute Book. In 1823, the House declined to allow him to introduce a Bill to prohibit bull-baiting and dog-fighting.

Early in 1824 he tried to bring in a Bill to prevent cruelty to dogs, cats, monkeys, and other animals. A Member asked if he intended to include rats, and Martin replied he did not. He claimed that his Act

had put an end to half the cruelty which formerly prevailed in the country.

This Bill was lost in the Lords. Martin introduced and subsequently withdrew another Bill to prevent bear-baiting and other cruel practices. He presented a petition from Manchester praying for the abolition of such amusements, and two days afterwards he unsuccessfully tried to get a committee appointed to inquire into the subject of cruel sports.

Soon afterwards, he brought in a Bill "to remedy the unhappy condition of horses in the knackers' yards."

When introducing the Bill, Martin told the House how he had once purchased a few trusses of hay and sent them to a knacker for his famished horses, but the animals never got them. He therefore sent some 200 unfranked letters to the man informing him of certain places where horses, asses, mules, cows, and other animals could be purchased, adding that "if he did not make haste the dead animals would be removed." By doing this he made the knacker spend some £15 in paying for the letters and other expenses.

Early in 1824, Martin summoned a man for cruelty to calves. The case is of interest because it shows that Martin did not always rely on his own efforts to bring offenders to justice; he employed an inspector. The time for the formation of a society which would employ many inspectors was near at hand.

George Cruikshank illustrated a lampoon of the time which was published under the title "Sights and Sketches in the Chapel of St Stephen's," giving a picture of "Mr. Martin, of Galway, awakening the sympathy and admiration of the House by recounting

a most piteous tale of the beating of a jackass in the Lambeth Road." In Parliament, and outside, Martin was the butt of gibes and mockery, but he persevered, and at last the British public, and even his fellow Members, were compelled to admire and appreciate his dauntless courage.

We get a little glimpse of the amusements of the people of this period from various sources. A report in *The Times* tells of the achievements of a dog, whose owner laid a wager that his dog would kill a hundred rats in an hour. The dog killed the rats to time, "to the satisfaction of a crowd of spectators." A boy then undertook to kill seventeen rats with his teeth in two and a half minutes and succeeded, "to the delight of the beholders."

Hone's "Everyday Book" gives an account of "A Tame Lion Bait with Dogs," that took place in Wombwell's Circus, in 1825.

"Mr. Martin's agent," it says, "came down the day before and applied to the local authorities to stop the exhibition, but the Mayor, and, afterwards, a magistrate, declined and refused to interfere on the ground that under Mr. Martin's present Act no steps could be taken before the act constituting 'cruelty' had been committed." The fight, which was largely advertised, must have been a dismal failure if the thousands of people who crowded to view it hoped to see the king of beasts in all his fierce majesty, for the three dogs set on the wretched animal seized him by the nose and tore the flesh from his bones. "The poor animal, howling with pain, only threw his paws awkwardly upon the dogs as they came." The public were bored by the lethargy of the lion, not guessing that he had been drugged! Public feeling was, how-

ever, changing. In 1825, this sight called forth only one letter of protest. In 1840, it was referred to as a brutal performance of the past. And this change had been brought about by Martin, Broome, and a handful of courageous reformers who had realized that cruelty lowered the standard of civilization.

Once when Martin's Parliamentary efforts on behalf of the animals were treated with derision, he was interrupted by curious noises. He ignored them until he had finished his speech. Then he stepped across the floor of the House from where the sounds had come, and demanded to know who had called out "Hare, hare!" Someone pointed to a City Member, and Martin, curbing his temper, said with a smile: "Oh, was it only an Alderman?"

Martin brought forward several other measures for the protection of animals. His last effort was on behalf of dogs. He was reminded that the House had already rejected a motion to prevent cruelty to domestic animals, dogs, of course, included, and therefore could not consistently support the present motion.

One Member expressed the hope that cats would be included in the Bill. It was well known, he said, that cats were worried by dogs and were, therefore, entitled to equal protection. If the House did not include cats they would be acting inconsistently, and if they admitted the measure at all they would turn legislation into ridicule.

Martin replied that, notwithstanding the mirth he had excited, he saw no reason why cats should not be protected against cruelty. He subsequently withdrew the Bill and said he would introduce a measure of a more comprehensive nature.

But this was Martin's last effort in Parliament. At

the next general election he was unseated, and he did not again enter the House.

It is recorded that when once his daughter referred to her father's many unsuccessful political ventures, Martin replied :

“One is like a mason dashing mortar against a wall. He wastes a great deal, but some of it sticks.” Would that he had lived to see how much of it had stuck in his case, and how he, by laying the foundation-stone of animal protection when he finally succeeded with his Act of 1822, was to alter the treatment of animals not only in Great Britain and Ireland, but also throughout the whole of the civilized world.

Afterwards, he took an active interest in the work of the Society and attended the meetings of the committee. It was; perhaps, characteristic of the man that on the only occasion when he signed the minutes he put his name in the wrong place and apparently overlooked the fact that the minutes were not dated.

Towards the close of his life he retired to Boulogne, but continued his active interest in the affairs of the Society, and in 1832 he wrote to the secretary about a Bill, amending his Act, which the Society were anxious to introduce. By order of the committee, Martin's letter was copied into the minute book of the Society. Naturally enough he was not altogether satisfied with the proposed amendments to his Act.

“Of the Act which bears my name,” he wrote, “I will say in justice to the Eminent Lawyer that prepared it, that it is a specimen of good legal penmanship, and it was said to have been so by Lord Lyndhurst, who opposed the Bill in all its stages. For this reason, Gentlemen ought to weigh well the

importance of the amendment to be proposed before they propose alterations or amendments of an Act that has done so much good and (to use the phrase) worked well. Those Gentlemen ought to bear in mind that to *alter* is not always to *improve*."

Martin died in 1834. He was nearly eighty years of age.

The Times published the following announcement of his death in its issue of January 10, 1834 :

"The evening papers announce the death of Mr. Richard Martin, the late eccentric M.P. for Galway. According to these accounts, Mr. Martin died at Boulogne on Monday the 6th inst., in the eightieth year of his age."

The little note hardly does justice to the man who laid the foundation on which all legal reforms for the benefit of animals have been based. Eccentric he may have been, but who shall say where eccentricity ends and genius begins? The point is that Martin—to use the homely phrase—"got there," and that his success in putting the first law for the protection of animals on the Statute Book was due mainly to his own exertions. He had the support of a very small body of humane men, but, as we have shown, Martin knew when to take the advice of his friends and when to ignore it.

It is curious that Charles Dickens, many of whose writings were inspired by a kindly desire to improve the lives of the people, should so have misjudged Richard Martin, who had constantly, though unsuccessfully, sought in Parliament to better the conditions for human beings, by striving, among other reforms, to have the death penalty abolished for forgery, and to enable accused persons to have the benefit of counsel. Dickens wrote of him: "The

Act for the prevention of cruelty to animals, commonly called Dick Martin's Act, was framed by Richard Martin, of Galway. It was a pity he could not exchange a little of his excessive tenderness for animals for some common sense and consideration for human beings!" This unjust condemnation, no doubt written without due care and with little knowledge, is surprisingly false when it is remembered that Martin was always on the side of the oppressed, whether they were human or animal.

Richard Martin, of Dangan and Ballynahinch Castle, Lord of Clare, and owner of property extending to some 200,000 acres, was born in February, 1754. He was the eldest son of Robert Martin and Bridget Barnewell, third daughter of the eleventh Baron Trimlestown. Though of a Roman Catholic family, he was the first of his family to be brought up in the Protestant faith, because his father desired him to go into the Irish Parliament to work for the emancipation of the Catholics. The Catholics in Ireland had been deprived of the franchise in 1727, and only Protestants were allowed to sit in Parliament. In compliance with his father's plans for his future, he was sent to Harrow and Trinity College, Cambridge, but left the University when twenty-two years of age without taking a degree in order that he might enter the Dublin Parliament, where he represented the Borough of Jamestown, Co. Leitrim. In 1801, the first Parliament after the Union—a measure which he warmly supported—he was returned for Co. Galway, and continued to represent it until the dissolution in 1826. George IV. was long Martin's personal friend—it was the King who first called him "Humanity Martin"—but their friendship

received a shock owing to Martin's espousement of the cause of Queen Caroline. He had the courage to speak in Parliament against the Alien Bill, which affected the Queen's trial, on July 10, 1820, and said: "As the Queen's friend (if I may be so bold) I do protest against this resolution." But a reconciliation between the two friends took place in Dublin, and the King presented him with two Arab horses—part of a present from the Shah of Persia. It is recorded that at the time of this reconciliation the King said to him: "I hear you are to have an election in Galway. Who will win?" Martin answered: "The survivor, Sire." Martin had gained, by duels with, among others, "Fighting Fitzgerald" (George Fitzgerald of Turlow, M.P. for Mayo), a reputation for duelling, so that this reply was double-edged. In writing about this duel, Sir Jonah Barrington, in his "Personal Sketches," gives an interesting description of Martin and Fitzgerald:

"Both were gentlemen of great public notoriety," he writes. "Both men of family and fortune, but of all the contrasts that ever existed in human nature, theirs were in the superlative degree, for modern biography does not present a character more eminently vindictive and sanguinary than the one, or an individual more signalized by active humanity and benevolence than the other. With the Chief of Conemara I have been now nearly forty years in a state of uninterrupted friendship. Failings he has—let him who is faultless cast the first stone. The character I should give him may be summed up in a simple sentence—urbanity towards women, benevolence towards men, and humanity towards the brute creation."

An interesting description of Martin appears in "The Retrospect of a Long Life," by Samuel Carter Hall :

"A short, thick-set man, with evidence in look and manner, even in step and action, of indomitable resolution. He blundered his way into a reform—blessed in its influences and mighty in its results. . . . Thus the wild, energetic, heedless, and usually unreasoning Irishman is for this act classed, and rightly so, among the benefactors of his country and all other countries of the Old World and the New. He was sincere as well as earnest in advocacy of the 'brute,' when such advocacy usually supplied only materials for mockery and scorn; and he was one of the very earliest of legislators to protest against the punishment of death for forgery. I believe Dick Martin had as warm and sound a heart as ever beat in human bosom. . . . He was almost idolized by the people over whom he ruled in wild Connemara. I heard this anecdote from one of his descendants. A rumour reached the district that the packet in which he was crossing from England to Ireland had been wrecked. Amid the lamentations, dismay, and confusion of the household in Ballynahinch, one aged woman retained self-possession and was heard to say :

" 'No one need be afearred for the master; for if he was in the midst of a raging sea the prayers of widows and orphans would keep his head above water.' "

Some years ago, the Society received the following notes about Richard Martin from his niece, Miss Harriet L. Martin :

"It may with truth be said that he was specially characterized by the universality of his benevolence,

by a large-hearted sympathy with suffering of whatsoever kind, not merely ready to serve when appealed to, but quick to anticipate the request, to divine the need. He could see, with his mind's eye, hunger written in the face of that man standing with his back turned to him, gazing into the cook-shop; he would stop to listen to the cry of the little child, and when he found it had been deserted, did not wait to be entreated to take it where it might get food and shelter, beneath his own kindly roof.

"No portraits could succeed in producing a living likeness of him, because they must fail to convey that expression which gave its peculiar character to his countenance, as well as to his whole demeanour. The expression I love to recall. I believe I must coin a word to describe it, and call it 'fatherliness.' . . . For every form of helplessness he had fatherly sympathy, and so it was written in his face. I remember it well."

Of the closing days of Martin's life, we have this from one who knew him well—Lewis Gompertz, the second honorary secretary of the Society :

"Happily his sufferings lasted only a few days; his anxiety to comfort the minds of his affectionate family, and that his favourite dog should be taken care of, are truly characteristic of the man whose motives were so pure. He stated to the last that he claimed no merit for all he had done."

Richard Martin was twice married. His surviving daughter was for many years a member of the Society.

CHAPTER III

THE FOUNDER OF THE SOCIETY

It is curious how one man, with a vivid personality and a picturesque reputation which appealed to his contemporaries and has been passed on as a kind of tradition, should overshadow another who, by his persistent and quiet work for animals, is really equally deserving of fame.

Richard Martin had all the characteristics of the proverbial Irish gentleman portrayed in Lever's novels. He was impetuous, generous to extravagance, a fighter for lost causes (some of which he inspired to success), a gallant gentleman in appearance, with an overmastering sense of humour which turned his enemies to friends. And so, against his wish, as may be seen, it came to be recognized that he was the founder of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. But with the generosity that one would expect from such a large-hearted man, he publicly gave the credit for founding the Society to the Rev. Arthur Broome. The Society's first anniversary meeting was reported in the *Courier* of July 1, 1825, and that paper stated :

"Mr. Martin then proposed thanks to the Rev. Mr. Broome, the originator and father of the Society. 'I have nothing at all to do with it,' he said; 'it is quite a child of Mr. Broome's, and he has acted the part of a good father to it; I must say that.'"

We mention the matter here because many people

are still under the impression that Martin himself founded the Society. We have many other proofs, beside Martin's own plain statement, that he was not the founder, and that that honour is due to Arthur Broome, but possibly Martin's own words will have more weight with some people than any other authority we could quote.

The Rev. Arthur Broome, the only son of Arthur Broome, of Sidmouth, Devon, must have been considerably younger than Richard Martin, for he was admitted to Balliol College, Oxford, in 1798, while we know that Martin had by that time already been in Parliament for twenty-two years. Unfortunately, little but the bare records of his life can be discovered, but one must appreciate the determination and courage which compelled him to strive for his object when one realizes that, as a clergyman, he was striking out a new line—one totally ignored by his brother clergy, in spite of Biblical teaching, and which was neither popular with nor understood by his fellow-men.

In 1801, he took his B.A. degree, and in the following year was ordained by the Bishop of London. In 1803, he was ordained priest, but no trace of his activities can be found until 1812, when we find that he was licensed as curate to the two parishes of Brook and Hinxhill, in Kent. Four years after that he became curate at Cliffe-at-Hoo, Kent, and during that period he had taken his Master of Arts degree.

In 1820, he came to London, and was appointed to the living of St. Mary's, Bromley St. Leonard (now Bromley-by-Bow). His experience in the country among people who looked upon cattle as farm implements to be used and abused at the will of their owners must have constantly brought home to him

the crying need for their protection, and his removal to London, near enough to Smithfield and the other centres of animal sale and animal slaughter, must surely have given him great inspiration for his campaign.

As has been shown in an earlier chapter, Mr. Broome had long cherished the idea of starting a society to protect animals and safeguard them from the cruelties which had generally been accepted as part of everyday life. In a short preface to his edition of the work of Dr. Primatt on cruelty to animals, which appeared in 1822 (the year in which Martin's Act, the first law for the protection of animals, was passed), he gave publicity to his views in his preface :

"The editor of the following pages cannot but regret his inability to procure any account whatever of their amicable and excellent author. The subject is one in which he has always felt peculiarly interested, from a deep conviction of its importance both in a moral and religious view; and as Dr. Primatt has treated it in great strength of reasoning and simplicity of language, he was induced to believe that a republication of the substance of his arguments in a form better adapted for circulation might be productive of good. Such was the object of this little tract, and if that object is attained by the preservation of ONE of the MEANEST of the animal creation from unnecessary pain and cruelty, he will think himself richly repaid for any labour he may have bestowed in the completion of it."

It is interesting, as the first recorded link between these two great pioneers of the animal cause, to note that he dedicated this book—

“To Richard Martin, Esq., M.P., whose active and unwearied zeal, both in a public and private capacity, in endeavouring to promote a more just and humane treatment of the brute species, bears ample testimony to the benevolence of his heart, and presents an example worthy of imitation, these pages are, with cordial respect and esteem, inscribed.”

On the passing of Martin's Act, Arthur Broome must have realized the possibility of seeing his ideal become a practical reality—and so he set about the formation of a society.

In *John Bull* for November, 3, 1822, there appeared the following advertisement :

“At a meeting of Gentlemen, lately held at Old Slaughter's Coffee House, St. Martin's Lane, the Rev. Mr. BROOME in the Chair, it was resolved,

“1. That a Society be formed for the purpose of preventing, as far as possible, the cruel treatment of brute animals.

“2. That a Committee, consisting of Twelve Members, be appointed to prepare the outline of a plan for the establishment of such a society, and that a general meeting be held early in the month of December next, of which due notice will be given by public advertisement.

“3. That the Rev. Mr. Broome be requested to accept the office of honorary Treasurer and Secretary to the proposed Institution, *pro tempore*.

“4. That the cordial thanks of this meeting are given to Richard Martin, Esq., M.P., to whose praiseworthy and indefatigable exertions, in the cause of humanity, the Public are indebted for a Bill introduced by him into Parliament, and passed into a law,

entitled 'A Bill for preventing the cruel and improper Treatment of Cattle.'

"Communications from persons who are willing to co-operate with the Society in its benevolent design, are requested to be addressed to the Secretary, free of postage, at Messrs. Whitmore and Fenn's, Book-sellers, Charing Cross."

No record exists of what transpired, nor is there any reference to this meeting or "the general meeting to be held early in the month of December next" in the Society's first minute book, so that one can only suppose that the effort failed. But Arthur Broome did not despair, for in 1823 he brought out a fresh edition of Dr. Primatt's book—this time disclosing his name, and added a footnote at the bottom of the title page: "Profits arising from the sale of this tract will be given to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals."

Evidently he felt optimistic as to the ultimate formation of his pet society, and being probably without great means himself, he strove to finance it to the best of his power. It is quite clear that no such society was in existence when the book was published, and that the attempt in the previous year had been abortive, for the newspaper report of the meeting at Old Slaughter's Coffee House on June 16, 1824, records a remark of Richard Martin to the effect that Mr. Broome had, himself, been employing a man as inspector to watch for cruelty. This must have been the first man so employed, and one can gauge how the work grew and has thriven, with the help of the generous public, when one remembers that at the present time the R.S.P.C.A., working in England

and Wales, alone employs two hundred and three full-time inspectors.

Even though the Society had not then been formed, Arthur Broome evidently found that the work of propaganda took up too much of his time, as it interfered with his clerical work. Consequently, he resigned his living early in 1824, and devoted his whole time to the realization of the one object which was needing his individual attention. On June 16, 1824, a meeting for the formation of the Society was again called at Old Slaughter's Coffee House.* (The name seems strangely appropriate when one thinks of the amount of cruelty which has been suppressed in connection with the slaughter of animals.) Richard Martin was among those present at the first meeting. T. Fowell Buxton, M.P., was in the chair.†

* Slaughter's Coffee House, famous as the resort of painters and sculptors, was situated at the upper end of the west side of St. Martin's Lane, three doors from Newport Street. Its first landlord was Thomas Slaughter, 1692. A second Slaughter's (new Slaughter's) was established in the same street about 1760, when the original establishment adopted the name of "Old Slaughter's," by which designation it was known till within a few years of the final demolition of the house to make way for the new avenue between Long Acre and Leicester Square, formed 1843-44. For many years previous to the streets of London being completely paved, "Slaughter's" was called "the Coffee House on the Pavement." Besides being the resort of artists, Old Slaughter's was the house of call for Frenchmen. (From Timbs' "Curiosities of London.")

† The following is a complete list of the members of the first two committees: Sir Jas. Mackintosh, M.P.; A. Warre, Esq., M.P.; Wm. Wilberforce, Esq., M.P.; Basil Montagu, Esq., Rev. A. Broome; Rev. G. Bonner; Rev. G. A. Hatch; A. E. Kendal, Esq.; Lewis Gompertz, Esq.; Wm. Mudford, Esq.; Dr. Henderson; T. F. Buxton, Esq., M.P.; Richard Martin, Esq., M.P.; Sir James Graham; L. B. Allen, Esq.; C. C. Wilson, Esq.; J. Brogden, Esq.; Alderman Brydges; E. A. Kendal, Esq.; E. Lodge, Esq.; J. Martin, Esq.; T. G. Meymott, Esq.

Two committees were formed, one to superintend the publication of tracts, sermons, "and similar modes of influencing public opinion," and one "to adopt measures for inspecting the markets and streets of the Metropolis, the slaughter-houses, the conduct of coachmen," etc. Among those who consented to serve on these committees were Sir James Mackintosh, who had carried on Sir Samuel Romilly's work of reforming our criminal laws, and William Wilberforce, known to everyone as the man who had abolished slavery. The chairman was a member of the well-known Norfolk family of that name, several of whose descendants are ardent workers for the cause.

In his opening speech, the chairman explained that their object was not only "to prevent the exercise of cruelty towards animals, but to spread amongst the lower orders of the people, especially amongst those to whom the care of animals was entrusted, a degree of moral feeling which would compel them to think and act like those of a superior class."

Mr. Buxton mentioned that Mr. Broome had employed a man named Wheeler "to keep an eye upon the men who brought cattle to Smithfield Market." During the past six months Wheeler had secured the conviction of sixty-three men for cruelty to animals.

Arthur Broome, called upon by the chairman to address the meeting, urged the adoption of every method for the purpose of directing the public attention to the subject, and suggested that tracts and sermons should be published to effect a change in the moral feelings of those who had the control of animals; but whether they should expend money in prosecuting individuals who were detected in com-

mitting outrages upon the creation, was a question upon which the Society must decide. He felt a strong aversion to prosecuting societies, and he thought that the payment of agents in such cases would be a premium leading to grievous prosecutions.

On the other hand, Mr. Meymott contended that prosecutions would be absolutely necessary, while the Rev. G. A. Hatch suggested that both courses might be adopted. They would not prosecute for beating a horse, but they would for breaking the leg of a cow by cruelly beating the animal. The slighter offences might be left to the operations of tracts.

Richard Martin agreed that, although prosecutions might be adopted in some cases, it would be ill-judged to stand forward as a prosecuting society. They might appoint agents to watch the conduct of those who frequented the markets, and those agents might prosecute upon their own responsibility and at their own expense. He had, himself, a good deal to do with the gentlemen who attended the markets, and he was convinced that nothing but punishment would have any effect upon them; yet to form a confederacy of prosecutors would throw a great unpopularity upon the Society's proceedings.

A revolution in morals, he claimed, had taken place by the passing of his Act. Not long ago, it was thought no disgrace by a gentleman to get rid, in any manner, of a racer or a hunter which had served him for eight or ten years. A widely different feeling now prevailed. He had been informed of an instance in which a gentleman of large fortune in Leicestershire, the heir to a title, who, having a hunter which had borne him at the head of the pack for eight or ten years, but unfortunately was disabled by an

accident from keeping its usual station, had the barbarity to sell the poor animal for £4 to draw coals from a mine. Now, since the passing of the Act, this heir to a title was so much ashamed of what he had done as to do all he could to conceal the transaction; and his friend was so much ashamed of the transaction as to refuse to tell the name of the performer of it.*

The chairman's resolution for the formation of a Society was carried unanimously.

Sir James Mackintosh expressed his full concurrence in what had been done, and called the attention of the meeting to the subject of slaughtering animals.† He asked whether shorter and less painful modes of slaughtering animals might not be adopted than those at present in use.

We have an impression of the inaugural meeting from one who was present. S. C. Hall, in his "Retrospect of a Long Life," referring to the meeting, says :

"I remember the meeting well, for I reported it. I had known Colonel Martin previously, and conversed with him then as to a project I no doubt considered visionary. I have lived to see even greater

* This is not, unfortunately, an isolated case. Even at the present time one sees wrecks of splendid hunters and carriage horses, who should, in gratitude of past pleasure and past services, have been pensioned off or have received the last kindness—the merciful bullet—working out their last days in misery and suffering.

† This subject, as will be seen in another chapter, has greatly occupied the attention of the Society. Reforms come gradually and very slowly. Unfortunately, though the first country to tackle the question of cruelty, England is, in respect to slaughtering animals for food, much behind Switzerland, Holland, Germany, Denmark and other European countries, which have dealt effectively with the subject.

events spring from smaller causes. It was a thin meeting—that I recall; but the Irish heartiness of Martin gave it warmth, fervour, and energy. I do not believe there was another person present so sanguine as to think that Parliament would ever be the protector of a ‘lower world.’ Yet the advocates had not long to wait. It is but a faint remembrance I have of the scene, but I can clearly call to mind Dick uttering an oath, essentially Irish, that ‘by —— he’d make them do it,’ and somehow he did.”

No mention is made in the reports of the speeches of the appointment of Arthur Broome as the first honorary secretary of the Society, but the minute book of the Society shows that he held this position.

At the committee meeting held on March 7, 1825, Richard Martin moved :

“That the thanks of the Society be given to the Rev. Mr. Broome for his attention to the interests of the Society and his zeal in the cause of humanity, and that he be desired to enter this on the journals.”

A little slip in Martin’s speech at the opening meeting of the Society was noticed by *John Bull*. That paper said that the meeting was held “in compliment to the excellent hearted member for Galway,” and added :

“The Hon. Member, to whom the public owe so much for the care which he bestows upon dumb creatures, mentioned a case which came within his own knowledge, of an heir to a title who sold a favourite horse, upon whose back he had hunted many years. So many persons have done the same thing that we should not stop particularly to notice it, except that the Hon. Member described the perfection of the animal in question to have been ‘that

for seven years he had carried his master over the country at the *head of his hounds*.' Seeing that if the horse had kept at the *tail of the hounds* it would have been more agreeable, we are only surprised that his master had not sold him a long while before he actually did sell him."

To the editor of the *Courier*, William Mudford, who was a member of one of the committees, the Society was doubtless indebted for a leading article on the meeting, which concluded with the following sentences :

"We know there are persons who affect to treat with an air of silly ridicule all efforts of this description. We do not participate in their sentiments; and we should be sorry if we did. No man need be ashamed of doing what he can to abate the practice of cruelty.

"Cowper says,

I would not enter on my list of friends,
Though grace'd with polish'd manner and fine sense,
The man who needlessly sets foot upon a worm.

"Our wish is, that the feeling which dictated this sentiment were as general as the language in which it is written."

Soon after the meeting, a prospectus of the Society was drawn up by Arthur Broome at the request of the committee.

During its first year, the Society successfully prosecuted in 149 cases of cruelty to animals. (The number is now over 4,000 a year, and before motors mercifully replaced the draught horse, the total reached to 8,000 a year.)

The first anniversary meeting of the Society was a

very happy one. The members had good reason for being in an optimistic mood. There had been a change for the better in the conduct of the Smithfield drovers; the Society had lived down some of the ridicule with which it had been assailed at its formation; many sermons on its behalf had been preached; many tracts had been distributed at schools; inspectors had been successfully employed; and branches of the Society had been formed at Wakefield and Liverpool. There was no hint at this meeting of impending disaster, but six months afterwards it was plainly evident that the existence of the Society was in peril. The Society was in debt.

From that moment the Society began a series of uphill fights for its life, and there came a time when the committee were faced with debts amounting to £315, of which £67 was owing to Arthur Broome.

For many years there has been a kind of tradition in the office that at this critical point in the Society's history, the committee, in a very despondent mood, met to decide the fate of the Society. They were on the point of winding-up the affairs of the Society, so the story goes, when in rushed a messenger announcing a legacy of £100 from Mrs. Radcliffe, the novelist.

"Saved," exclaimed the committee, as one man, and from that moment—we are still giving the story—the existence of the Society was assured. No more difficulties, no more debts. Mrs. Radcliffe had saved the Society in most dramatic fashion.

This happens to be one of those stories which ought to be true, but is not. In the first place, Mrs. Radcliffe died in February, 1823, seventeen months before the Society was started, and, in the second place, the

minute book of the Society shows plainly enough that the £100, which certainly did come just in the nick of time, was given by William Radcliffe, the widower of the novelist. Possibly Mrs. Radcliffe may have given or left the money to her husband to be used for charitable purposes and he, knowing the Society's great needs, decided to give £100 to its funds.

The story that this money put the Society on its feet is unhappily not true. Arthur Broome received £10 on account of the debt owing to him, and the committee decided that they were not justified in meeting in the inexpensive rooms which Arthur Broome had rented as offices for the Society.

But though every day brought fresh examples of the need for the work of the new Society, public support was, unfortunately, very meagre, and in the following year (1826) the committee was faced with very serious financial difficulties. As secretary, Arthur Broome was legally held responsible for the Society's debts, and as he had sacrificed his profession for his new work and had, therefore, lost his stipend, he was not in the position to meet his debts. He was cast into prison—another sacrifice for his ideal—but Richard Martin and Lewis Gompertz (subsequently the second honorary secretary of the Society) went to his rescue and he was liberated. When one recalls this fact one cannot be too thankful that the law with regard to debts has been altered, or his successors, including the present secretary, might have run the risk of being guests of His Majesty's Government.

The balance of the £100 given by Mr. Radcliffe was soon spent, and the money difficulties of the Society continued. The year 1827 was the blackest of all the years in the history of the Society. At one

time the committee were on the point of deciding to pay the outstanding debts themselves and to dissolve the Society. But they persevered and contrived to hold three meetings in 1827. The first of these was in August. The other two meetings were held in November, and at the latter only three members were present—Lewis Gompertz, Arthur Broome, and W. A. Mackinnon.

Gompertz had drawn up a paper giving full details of the state of affairs, and it was resolved to print this and to reimburse Gompertz for the expense “as soon as all the pressing just demands against the Society are discharged.”

One can readily imagine that Arthur Broome, deprived by his own enthusiasm for this work of his clerical stipend, had to find other means of subsistence, and evidently this work—whatever it was—began to occupy much of his time. In consequence of this we find in the minutes of the meeting held on February 29, 1828, that the committee passed the following resolution :

“Resolved that this Society feel highly indebted to the Rev. A. Broome for his services as honorary secretary, and regret that he should find it inconvenient to attend to the duties of the office, and that Lewis Gompertz be requested to accept the office of honorary secretary.”

The committee probably considered that the somewhat curt resolution was a poor return to make to the man who had given up his living in order to form the Society, had worked unceasingly for nearly four years for the good of the Society, and had suffered imprisonment because of the Society. A few days afterwards, the committee were more considerate to the

founder; they passed the following resolution and decided to send a copy of it to Arthur Broome :

“The committee of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals beg leave to express to the Rev. Arthur Broome their sincere regret for his absence from their several late meetings and to observe that as the committee are now making every effort to redeem the Society from the effects of its late difficulties and to enable it to resume its former activity, they have resolved to assemble more frequently than usual till such object is accomplished, by which the attendance of a secretary will be rendered just now peculiarly necessary, and the committee having therefore requested Lewis Gompertz to exercise that office, and he, having obligingly assented thereto, are desirous of receiving to the measure the sanction of Mr. Broome, whose approbation as the benevolent founder of the Society they shall ever deem necessary to all regulations of importance to its objects and government.”

The founder of the Society ceased to be its honorary secretary from March 10, 1828, but he remained a member of the committee, continued to take an active interest in the work, and was present at several meetings of the committee. In 1831, he brought out an abridged edition of Dr. Primatt's book, on the title page of which he described himself as the founder of the Society. This book was dedicated in the following terms :

“To the Most Noble the Dowager Marchioness of Salisbury, this treatise which pretends to no other merit than that of advocating a cause in which Her Ladyship was one of the earliest and most distinguished supporters, is, with sentiments of the

deepest respect and veneration, inscribed by the Editor."

In the report of the Society for the year ending May 5, 1832 (the first printed report in existence), Arthur Broome's name appears as founder and as a member of the committee. This is the last mention of him in connection with this work, for in the following year's report his name does not appear and no mention of his death at Birmingham on July 16, 1837, is made in the Society's records. In the turmoil of events connected with the death of William IV. and the accession of Queen Victoria, he seems to have slipped out of the world "unwept, unhonoured, and unsung."

His death is not referred to in any report of the Society, and all efforts to discover his grave have failed. Many of the graves of the churchyard in which he was probably buried have been removed, and so it has not been possible to do honour to the resting-place of the founder of the Society.

But Arthur Broome has a better memorial than any monument of stone—the Society which he founded. Looking back to the preface of his book, we may rest assured that before he died he rejoiced to see his Society firmly established, and that he felt himself well rewarded for all the work he had done, the sacrifices he had made, and the sufferings he had endured for the cause he had at heart.

CHAPTER IV

EARLY DIFFICULTIES AND VICTORIES

LEWIS GOMPERTZ, as was stated in the previous chapter, took over the work as honorary secretary in 1828. He had been closely connected with the Society from its commencement, he had attended the first meeting, and was a member of its first committee. Prior to the inaugural meeting, but in the same year, he had published a book entitled "Moral Enquiries on the Situation of Man and of Brutes," and from this work we can readily understand that he had made a careful study of his subject. He suggested the establishment of societies whose business should be to investigate and discuss "all moral subjects and customs," and to present petitions to Parliament. He suggested that these might be called Petition Societies, and added: "The suppression of cruelty and the amelioration of the state of brutes in cases which might fail of engaging the attention of higher authority should be two of the chief aims of these societies."

As honorary secretary, he set to work promptly, put the Society's affairs in order, and called committee meetings regularly each month. By the middle of the year, the Society had turned the corner, all the debts had been paid, and there was a balance in hand of £3. Lewis Gompertz devoted all his time to the work of the Society, contributed generously to its funds, and even assisted the inspectors in their work of detecting cases of cruelty to animals.

66 EARLY DIFFICULTIES AND VICTORIES

Having rescued the Society from its debts, Gompertz set out to increase its activities and to attract the support of the public. In 1829, he wrote a tract on the objects of the Society, which gives us a pen-picture of the many forms of cruelty to animals prevalent at the time. Thus :

Sheep were driven "for above a hundred miles" to the markets, and were goaded through the crowded streets of the Metropolis, where, after vainly attempting to allay their thirst by the filth of the gutters, they dropped from exhaustion. Sometimes their ears were torn off by dogs, sometimes their eyes were knocked out and their legs broken by drovers.

The slaughter-houses were from ten to twelve feet underground, and into these the sheep were flung. The method of slaughter was "according to the uncontrolled fancy of the operator."

Oxen were compelled to travel for many days with little or no food. Footsore and weary, they were hunted by Spitalfields weavers or were hamstrung on their way to the slaughter-house, where they were killed by "repeated blows of hammers on their heads."

Calves were packed into carts with their legs tied together, and were afterwards kept for days in the underground slaughter-house where they were slowly bled—to make the flesh white. During the process their mouths were "kept closely muzzled with straps lest the public should be attracted by their moans."

When a calf was to be killed, an iron rod, hooked at each end, was used. One end of this instrument was driven through the flesh under the tail of the calf and the other through the nose. The head was thus drawn upwards and to one side. Sometimes a calf

would be killed by being knocked on the head; sometimes the calf would be bled in the position secured by the iron instrument, "till relieved by death from its misery."

Horses and donkeys were driven to death. Various animals were caused "to mangle each other in public theatres and pits." Bulls were baited for several days, "by which parts of their tongues are frequently torn off." Eels were skinned alive; pigs were whipped to death. In the streets one heard "the unceasing sound of the lash."

The Society had tried to put down these barbarities and in some instances had succeeded. They persuaded the drovers not to fling the sheep into the underground slaughter-houses, but to let the animals walk down some boards. The custom of tying calves' legs together had become a little less common, and a certain form of cruelty to cats had been stopped. "Cats thrown into the Tower ditch, which at one time were commonly seen through the grating on Tower Hill, confined to the drains till starved or drowned by heavy rains, have been caused by the Society to be released and restored to their owners, while the recurrence of the evil has been prevented." But the Society had not yet been able to suppress bull-baiting.

In spite of the efforts of Gompertz, backed up by the committee, the response of the public was inadequate, and by the end of 1830 the Society was once more in difficulties, Gompertz was again obliged to advance money himself to meet the expenses, and the committee decided to cut down the expenses of prosecutions and printing.

The Society's difficulties were still further increased

in the following year (1831) owing to a dispute between the honorary secretary and a member of the committee. At the general meeting in 1832, Lewis Gompertz was thanked for his work in redeeming the Society "from a state of exhaustion and debt," a resolution was passed recording the sense of the great interest constantly shown by him in the welfare of the Society, and a silver medal was awarded to him. At the same time, the Society declined to interfere in a dispute between their honorary secretary and a member of the committee.

Shortly afterwards, the committee passed a resolution stating that the proceedings of the Society were entirely based on the Christian faith and on Christian principles. This act was prejudicial to the best interests of the Society, since it was aimed at the honorary secretary, a man who had striven hard, and with great success, to educate the public in what was undoubtedly a very unpopular cause. The Society's platform to-day is unsectarian and unpolitical—all meet together, united in furthering the one object of the Society—to prevent cruelty to animals.

When the resolution referred to was passed, Gompertz naturally resigned, and started a society of his own, with a magazine in which to record its doings; but though he managed it extremely well he did no harm to the parent Society, which was beginning to extend its influence all over the country. At this time, two other animal protection societies were in existence, but they were short-lived. Gompertz continued the work of his own society until 1846, when, owing to ill-health, he gave up public work.

All friends of the Society should remember the name of Lewis Gompertz with gratitude, for un-

doubtedly he saved the Society from extinction in the most difficult period of its existence. He was loyal to the ancient teachings of his race, which had always—according to the civilization of those early days—cared for animals in their possession, and he gave practical form to the teaching of the ancient Hebrews, while adapting his ideas to the requirements of the times in which he lived. Therefore, his memory must ever be held in respect and gratitude as one of those who rendered possible the successes which have done so much to make the R.S.P.C.A. a power not only in Great Britain but all over the civilized world.

Owing, no doubt, to the resignation of Lewis Gompertz, the Society found itself once more in financial straits; its income for that year was only £240, and there was a debt of £94 owing to the honorary treasurer, Samuel Gurney. The bulk of the income was spent in wages of inspectors, printing, stationery, etc.

The rent of the Society's office at 190, Regent Street, was £25 a year. The prudent committee took the place provisionally for a month and obtained permission for the Society's brass plate to be fixed to the door. The landlord found that he could not fix the brass plate on the door, whereupon the committee (we quote from the minute book) "proposed that he should abate 5s. per week, which he did not object to."

In spite of the lack of public support, the Society's committee declined to be pessimistic; they had undertaken the work of preventing cruelty to animals, and they intended to go through with it—with or without public support. Undaunted by the fact that the Society could not pay its way, and finding that they

could not make much headway with the public, one or two members of the committee resolved to see what they could do in Parliament. They decided, therefore, to try and improve the one Act then in force—Martin's Act—by increasing its scope.

William Alexander Mackinnon, M.P., a member of the committee, who had taken a great interest in the work of the Society from its formation, succeeded in introducing a Bill into Parliament "for consolidating and amending the laws relating to the cruel and improper treatment of animals."

The need of such a measure was very great. Ten years had gone by since the passing of Martin's Act. That Act protected cattle, including horses, but it did not protect domestic animals, and, since the Judges, in their profound wisdom, had held that a bull was an animal of superior degree, not to be classed among cattle, Martin's Act had not enabled the Society to suppress bull-baiting. Though Mackinnon's Bill failed, a Select Committee was appointed to inquire into the question of cruelty to animals, and the Society scored a point, for its inspectors were officially recognized and were called to give evidence.

The Select Committee afterwards reported that they were satisfied that numerous and wanton cruelties were practised "to the great and needless sufferings of dumb animals, and to the demoralization of the people." The committee were of opinion that some further legislative enactments were necessary to prevent, as far as possible, the continuance of the cruel and improper treatment of animals.

The evidence taken by the Select Committee disclosed reports of cats being skinned alive (the skins being used for imitation furs), reports of dog-fighting

and badger-baiting, and of brutality to dogs used for draught purposes.

Nothing more could be done during the session, and, unfortunately, Mackinnon was not in the next Parliament, but his place, so far as the Society was concerned, was taken by Joseph Pease, M.P. for South Durham, and a member of the Society's committee.

Meanwhile, owing to lack of funds and to the strong prejudice entertained by magistrates against the evidence of “paid informers,” the Society discontinued the regular employment of inspectors. But the work of inspection did not cease, as several members of the committee undertook the task, and when they came across any very flagrant cases of cruelty to animals they prosecuted the offenders.

Joseph Pease won a victory for animals by proceeding cautiously. An Act was in force authorizing the Court of Aldermen to make regulations as to the driving of cattle in the City of London and Westminster. The original object of the Act was not the prevention of cruelty to animals, but to prevent people from being injured by cattle driven through the streets.

Joseph Pease induced Parliament to insert two clauses into that Act. One clause extended all the powers of the Act relative to the driving of cattle to a distance of five miles from Temple Bar. The other clause suppressed the pits and other places where dog-fighting and cock-fighting took place within five miles of Temple Bar.

The Society had advanced a little way towards its goal; in 1835, its progress was more marked and was, in fact, apparent even to the callous public. In that year, the Society was honoured by receiving the

patronage of the Duchess of Kent and Princess Victoria, and from that moment the continued existence of the Society was assured. Richard Martin had prepared the ground; Arthur Broome had sown the seed; but who knows what might have happened to the plant if it had never received the protective care bestowed upon it by the young Princess who was so soon to become the Queen?

The speakers at the Society's annual meeting in 1835 had good cause to be jubilant. Lord Dudley C. Stuart, M.P., who took the chair, said that the Society was now pretty well known throughout the country. Several speakers referred hopefully to the excellent attendance at the meeting, and one of them reminded the meeting that "Joseph Pease's Bill" had passed the second reading without opposition. This Bill was practically the same as the one introduced by Mackinnon, and therefore very important to the Society, since its object was to protect all domestic animals from cruelty.

Now mark what followed. It has been said that the Society succeeded in these early days in spite of itself, and that its supporters were not always its best friends. Their intention was good, but they blundered. To say that may seem unfair to those humane pioneers, but sometimes their mistakes were certainly rather glaring! Here, at a meeting of the Society, at which everyone was looking forward hopefully to securing a much-needed reform for the benefit of animals, someone—and a Vice-President of the Society, too—came forward to tell these eager, hard-working folk that they could not possibly succeed! The enemies of the Society must have smiled approvingly when they read this extraordinary state-

ment made by such a false prophet who held an honoured position in the Society :

“ It is impossible to make people humane by Acts of Parliament ; many animals, for example, are beyond the reach of legislation—for instance, dogs. What law, I ask, could protect them, without the odious alternative of intrusion on private life? It is not because we wish to be less kind to dogs that we would exclude them from protection, but because we wish to avoid an inquisition into private life.”

Everyone else at the meeting and all the friends of the Society outside it must have known of Joseph Pease's Bill which was at that moment (1835) before Parliament—a Bill which aimed at protecting all domestic animals, dogs, of course, included. Joseph Pease himself spoke at this meeting, and even he was a little sceptical about being able to do much for dogs. He confessed that he could not undertake the task of trying to prevent dogs from being used as beasts of burden. He said :

“ Such attempts would expose me to, perhaps, deserved ridicule, not that we are the less insensible to the sufferings of those animals—for all must feel indignant at seeing a couple of ruffians drawn painfully in a cart by one or two of these poor creatures—but the means of preventing such occurrences must be sought for not in legislative enactments, but in other sources.”

Fortunately for dogs, Pease was in the wrong, and the propaganda work done by Martin, Broome, Gompertz, and others was already bearing fruit. Though these pessimistic utterances were made at the meeting on June 3, the Bill, which was to protect all domestic animals, passed through the Commons with practic-

ally no opposition, went through the Lords without discussion, and received the Royal Assent on September 9.

The new measure provided a maximum penalty of forty shillings and a minimum of five shillings for cruelty to any animal. By this Act, keeping or using a place for baiting bulls, bears, dogs, or other animals, or for cock-fighting, became punishable.

It was at this annual meeting of 1835 that the Society decided to have a Humane Drivers Fund, so that ladies might reward some of the men and boys who treated their animals well. The fund did not long remain in existence, not through lack of support, but because there were no humane drivers to receive the awards.

A little note in this (1835) report is of great interest :

“It may be well worthy of consideration whether metal labels might not be very beneficially granted by the Society to those drivers who receive certificates of good and kind behaviour.” The custom of giving “metal labels” in the form of brass badges of merit was subsequently inaugurated, and they are still awarded by the Society. This custom is constantly growing in popularity, and at such Parades as the London Cart Horse, the Van Horse, and at many other shows held in different parts of the country the Society’s “brasses” are eagerly sought and greatly prized.

Within two months of the passing of the Act which made bull-baiting illegal, the Society took action in a case which afterwards became famous. The subsequent proceedings extended over three years, and ended, as will be seen, in a triumphant victory for the Society.

CHAPTER V

BULL-BAITING, COCK-FIGHTING, ETC.

THE action referred to at the conclusion of the preceding chapter was directed against the custom of "bull-running"—a form of bull-baiting—observed annually at Stamford, Lincolnshire. Since it is not likely that any reader has even seen a bull baited, we give here a description of the sport, published in 1840,* when it was stated that "occasional recurrences of this cruel sport are even yet to be met with."

"The animal is fastened to a stake driven into the ground for the purpose, and about seven or eight yards of rope left loose, so as to allow him sufficient liberty for the fight. In this situation a bulldog is slipped at him, and endeavours to seize him by the nose; if the bull be well practised at the business, he will receive the dog on his horns, throw him off, and sometimes kill him; but, on the contrary, if the bull is not very dexterous, the dog will not only seize him by the nose, but will cling to his hold till the bull stands still; and this is termed *pinning the bull*. What are called good game bulls are very difficult to be pinned, being constantly on their guard, and placing their noses close to the ground, they receive their antagonist on their horns; and it is astonishing to what distance they will sometimes throw him. It is not deemed fair to slip or let loose more than one dog at one and the same time. When a bull is fairly

* Blaine's "Rural Sports."

pinned, should he break loose, such is the unconquerable determination of the dog, that he will rarely quit his hold, but will be seen to remain pendent from the muzzle of the running bull."

The bull-running of Stamford was conducted in a different way. A bull was brought into the town. The roads were blockaded to prevent the bull from escaping, the animal was hunted about until it was exhausted, and then the dogs were set upon it.

The earliest records of bull-baiting refer to the sport as carried on at Stamford; in 1209, a sum of money was left "for the continuance of that sport for ever." Stamford may therefore be said to have been the home of bull-baiting, and in trying to suppress it at the fountain head the Society was teaching a lesson to the followers of the sport in other places.

The Society's action, it must be remembered, was begun in 1835. The committee doubtless knew that in putting the recently passed Act into operation they would have the support of many humane people, for even at the beginning of the nineteenth century bull-baiting was falling into disrepute. We see this from a report in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for December, 1802—twenty years before any law for the protection of animals was in existence. This report refers to the baiting of a bull at Stamford, and concludes with :

"Surely diversions of this sort, if we may give them such an appellation, are not only a reproach to human nature, but a disgrace to every Christian country."

The annual bull-baiting at Stamford was always held in November, and in October, 1835, some humane persons informed the Society that placards



BULL BAITING.
From an old colour print



BEAR BAITING.
From an old colour print (see p. 4).

announcing the event had been put up in the town. The Society's secretary wrote to the Mayor of Stamford, sent him a copy of the new Act prohibiting bull-baiting, and expressed the hope that he would consider it his public duty to try to prevent the baiting taking place. The Society offered to reimburse the Mayor for any expense that might be incurred.

A letter was also sent to the Town Clerk. The official reply was that the magistrates declined to interfere, but they would be ready to attend to any information which might be laid before them against any person who might act "contrary to the intent and meaning of the Act of Parliament."

The reply was not disappointing, because the Society knew that the Mayor and several of the Aldermen subscribed to the expenses of the "sport."

The Society's secretary, Mr. Henry Thomas, accompanied by a private detective, went to Stamford and watched the proceedings. Great caution was necessary, because if their identity had become known their lives would have been in danger.

The Society thus obtained the evidence needed, but could not use it, as it would have been futile to summon any of the offenders before the Mayor of Stamford. Acting on legal advice, the Society decided to wait until the following year before taking action. Accordingly, the Mayor of Stamford was again approached in 1836, but with the same result, and therefore the Society took action against the promoters of the bull-baiting by indictment at the County Assizes.

The Society's secretary, Mr. Thomas, served the warrants on the parties. His personal safety was endangered, and he applied to the Mayor of Stam-

ford for protection. The Mayor admitted that such protection was needed, but refused to give it.

The case was tried at Lincoln Assizes in July, 1837.

Counsel for the Society quoted the following words from a book written by Richard Butcher, Town Clerk of Stamford in 1646 :

“The second sport, though more ancient than the former (racing), is yet more beastlike than any; it is their bull-running—a sport of no pleasure except to such as take pleasure in beastliness and mischief.”

The chief offenders were found guilty. Early in 1838 they were brought up for judgment in the Court of Queen's Bench. Counsel for the Society agreed that the Society had taken action solely with the object of suppressing bull-baiting, and the defendants were bound over.

In spite of the Society's action, the bull-running took place as usual at Stamford in November, 1837, but this time it was the turn of the promoters of the sport to act with great caution. The bull was brought into the town secretly in the middle of the night, and two policemen who saw it were entreated to say nothing about it.

The magistrates had been called upon by Lord John Russell, the Home Secretary, to give their attention to the illegal proceedings, and between two and three hundred special constables had been sworn in.

The Mayor of Stamford subsequently drew attention to the heavy charge brought on the town by the friends and advocates of bull-running, for the town was called upon to pay for the expenses of the special constables.

In spite of the Society's action, another attempt to hold the bull-running was made in November, 1838,

when the Home Secretary again interfered. A troop of the 14th Dragoons and twelve Metropolitan policemen were brought to the town, and two bulls, provided by the promoters of the "sport," were seized by the police. The mob managed to hunt a young bull calf for a short time, but it was rescued.

This was the last attempt at bull-running at Stamford; after a struggle lasting for three years the Society won the day.

Meanwhile, the Society had prosecuted in other cases of bull-baiting, and always with success. At Wheatley, Oxfordshire, where bull-baiting had taken place for over two hundred years, and at Stone, Staffordshire, there was no difficulty in enforcing the law.

At Wheatley an effort was made to substitute badger-baiting for bull-baiting, but as badger-baiting was also illegal, the Society was able to stop it.

The last bull-baiting case conducted by the Society was in 1870, when a troupe of Spanish bull-fighters gave a display of their skill at the Agricultural Hall. It had been announced that the performances would be given "without the infliction of cruelty," but when darts with sharp spikes were thrown at one of the bulls, Mr. Colam, secretary of the Society, followed by a number of the Society's inspectors and the police, rushed into the ring and stopped the exhibition. The Spaniards were prosecuted and fined.

The suppression of cock-fighting was a more difficult matter. Cock-fighting was a much older sport than bull-baiting, though we believe there is no record of it in this country before the twelfth century; at that time it was considered to be a children's amusement.

"Every year," says Fitzstephen, "on the morning

of Shrove Tuesday, the schoolboys of the city of London bring gamecocks to their masters, and in the forepart of the day, till dinnertime, they are permitted to amuse themselves with seeing them fight; the cockpit was the school, and the master the controller and director of the pastime."

*Later on, cock-fighting became a fashionable amusement, but was prohibited in 1366 by public proclamation as an "idle and unlawful pastime." Little attention seems to have been paid to the proclamation. Henry VIII. added a cockpit to the palace at Whitehall, and James I. patronized the sport regularly twice a week.

In spite of strict rules for regulating a fight, disputes were fairly frequent. When a fight had been started, no one was allowed to touch the two birds "except they either hang in the mat, in each other, or get close to the edge of the pit, until they leave off fighting so long as a person can count forty." Then the birds were taken to the middle of the pit and placed "beak to beak," when they were not to be touched until one bird had refused to fight for as long as a person could count ten. This plan was continued until one bird had refused ten times. The birds were usually armed with steel or silver spurs.

In a Welch Main, which Strutt described as "a disgrace to us as Englishmen," fourteen pairs of birds were generally used; the birds fought until half of them were killed, then half of the conquerors fought the other half, and the sport was continued until only one bird remained.

Although the cock-fights were a breach of the Act of 1835, they were openly advertised in the papers

* Strutt's "Sports and Pastimes."

with fictitious addresses, the real addresses being known to the friends and patrons of the sport. To bring the offenders to justice was almost an impossible task, and the Society, in undertaking it, received little help from the magistrates, some of whom declined to assist the Society to enforce the law.

At some places, the cock-fights were conducted openly. At Chester, for example, cock-fights were held during the races, and the opening of the cockpits was announced by the beating of a drum. The Society appealed to the Mayor of Chester for assistance, but he declined to interfere. Possibly it may have occurred to the Mayor that any man who tried to stop cock-fighting was running the risk of incurring something worse than unpopularity. The Society's inspectors were very roughly handled at times by the followers of this sport, and after a riot at a cockpit at Hanworth in 1838 one of the inspectors died from the injuries he had received. His assailant was never discovered. In some places, county matches were held, a match usually consisting of fifteen battles at £10 a battle. In 1841, the Society succeeded in stopping a cock-fighting match, held at Southport, between Gloucestershire and Nottinghamshire.

Cock-fighting was not finally suppressed until many years afterwards. Every now and again the Society would congratulate itself, at its annual meetings, on having successfully scotched this form of cruelty, but again and again cases were discovered. The truth seems to be that cock-fighting was regarded as a "cleaner" sport than the other barbarities—bull-baiting, bear-baiting, dog-fighting, badger-baiting. The suppression of these "sports" gave little trouble, but even as late as 1875 the Society was still engaged in

stopping cock-fighting; in that year eighteen successful prosecutions were recorded.

We must now go back to 1835, in which year the Society began their proceedings in the bull-running case at Stamford. Other events, equally important to the Society, occurred about that time.

CHAPTER VI

THE ROYAL FAMILY AND THE SOCIETY

IN the year 1835, when Princess Victoria, by honouring the Society with her patronage, relieved its supporters from all anxiety about its future, the public were learning to be kind to animals.

All domestic animals were protected by the law passed in that year, but many acts of gross cruelty to animals were of common occurrence, and we propose to glance at a few of them.

At that time, certain people in London gained their living by stealing cats, skinning them while they were alive, and selling their skins for "imitation fur." We have no doubt whatever that Queen Victoria, who was very fond of cats (we will presently give proof of that statement), knew of this form of cruelty to cats, and wished to aid the Society in its war against that "detestable race—the cat skimmers," as Lord Carnarvon described them at one of the Society's meetings.

"I have seen it distinctly proved," he said, "that the skins have been torn from the quivering frames, and the victims of this brutality have been allowed to survive for many hours of intolerable anguish."

The skin of the female cat was preferred to that of the male, and it was supposed that a live animal could be skinned more easily than a dead one.

The Society prosecuted several persons for skinning cats alive; on the premises of a woman and her two daughters, who made their living by selling skins,

were found the remains of 150 cats that had been skinned alive.

This form of cruelty had existed for some years, but until the Act of 1835, which protected all domestic animals, was passed, offenders were not always punished. Thus, in September, 1832, a young woman was charged with having stolen thirteen cats from different parts of the parish of Cripplegate. When a constable stopped the woman, she had thirteen skins in her possession; one of them was quite warm. The magistrate said he understood there was no law for the protection of cats. The constable, who probably remembered what had been done in other cases of the kind, said he hoped the woman would not be allowed to go away unpunished; with a piece of baited liver she enticed the poor things into her reach, and then "whipped off their jackets." In a few minutes they were struggling and sprawling skinless on the ground, and he had the trouble of disposing of them.

Another witness said cats were often found in the dead of night in back courts still alive and without their "jackets."

The magistrate said if the law had enabled him to do so he would have punished the woman, but he must discharge her, and the case was accordingly dismissed.

The case should not have been dismissed; true, there was no law for the protection of cats, but there was a certain Paving Act which provided penalties for people who created a nuisance in a street. At the conclusion of another cat skinning case, the magistrate had fined the offender forty shillings for creating a nuisance; he had thrown the carcass of the cat into the street.

It is worth while to notice the change in public opinion regarding this form of cruelty to cats. At one time, the public paid little attention to it, but in 1854, at the hearing of a cat skinning case in which a man was sentenced to three months' hard labour, it was stated that the people in the neighbourhood were so angry with the prisoner that the police had considerable difficulty in keeping them from throwing him into the Fleet Canal.

After the hearing of a similar case in August, 1859, the maximum penalty—three months' hard labour—was inflicted; when the offender was taken out to the prison van his fellow-prisoners booed him.

As we propose dealing with the subject of cruelties to dogs in a separate chapter, we say no more, in passing, than that many dogs were shamefully ill-used at the time when Princess Victoria came to the rescue of the Society.

Horses were then, as sometimes at the present time, regarded by many people as mere machines, but there was some hope that a better time was in store for them; it was thought that horses would be superseded by steam. The public were demanding that coaches should be faster, but with increased speed, accidents were more frequent and more severe. The committee of the Society tried unsuccessfully to secure the passing of an Act to prevent the overloading and overdriving of horses in omnibuses, cabs, and other public carriages.

The report of 1838 states that the Society had employed "three powerful horses" in assisting to draw carriages of all descriptions up Holborn and Ludgate Hills, and caused several loads of ashes, etc., to be spread on the roads during the winter.

The Society does not now provide trace-horses at hills. It was found that carters, knowing that such horses were provided for them, gave their own horses the maximum load which they could pull on a level road. The provision of trace-horses at hills thus encourages rather than diminishes cruelty to horses.

A prosecution for cruelty was not always an easy matter in those days. An M.P. who went to Kilburn one day (in 1837) to see the new railway, found a man ill-treating a horse and called a policeman. The policeman declined to interfere on the ground that if he did so he would be subjected to the "resentment and ill-treatment of all the excavators near the place," who, he said, were a most desperate and lawless set of men. The M.P. informed the Society, who took up the case and called the policeman to give evidence.

Some of the men employed in making the railways seem to have been unusually brutal to their horses. The contractors who were making the line at Reading employed a number of hardened ruffians called "dog-whippers," whose sole duty it was "to flog the horses and curse the men" engaged in the work.

Men who worked with horses near water seem to have been more gentle. It was mentioned at the 1838 meeting of the Society that at one time no horses were so ill-used as those employed at the canals, but the men had reformed. Their horses were no longer driven by the lash but by the sound (whether of the lash or of the driver's voice, the speaker did not say), and any man who "lacerated an animal" was dismissed.

Some of the cases at this time disclosed instances of senseless brutality to animals. Thus, the Society

successfully prosecuted a man for beating a horse which had one leg dislocated at the fetlock; the man broke a stick over the unfortunate animal. Another man, finding that his horse was unable to pull a heavily laden cart out of the mud, lit a fire under the horse and burned it. These two men were on a level with the pig-dealer who bought five pigs, put them in a sty, and left them to starve. When the Society found these pigs, two of them had died from starvation, and the three remaining were devouring the dead. The man was fined £2—the maximum fine at that time—and 16s. costs.

The worst horses must have been those in the night cabs of London. Knackers sold condemned horses for use in the streets at night, and the horses were generally worked until they dropped dead.

It was during this period that the Society first sent inspectors to watch over ponies and donkeys employed on the sands at seaside towns. Many holiday makers were prosecuted. Southend's visitors seem to have been the worst offenders; their cruelties were described as "of the most revolting description." The cases were heard at Rochford, the magistrates of which spoke approvingly of the Society, and said they hoped that the "constables," as the Society's inspectors were then called, would be again stationed at Southend. Perhaps the donkey-keepers of Southend did not set a very good example; it was reported of one of them that he could knock down a donkey with one blow from his fist. The Society prosecuted two men who rode a donkey round a field until it fell from exhaustion; they then beat it with sticks, tore out its tongue, and otherwise mutilated it. The men were sentenced to six weeks' hard labour.

Cattle were grossly ill-used on their way to and from markets. For some time before this period, the Society had urged the need of improvements in Smithfield Market, and the City Corporation eventually enlarged it. More gas lamps were provided, by which, says the report, "the old system of torches is now rendered unnecessary, and which was a continual cause of terror to affrighted and timid animals." The report points out that cattle and sheep need not now be brought into the market until after twelve o'clock at night, "thus the Sunday evening will not be desecrated, and the animals will be in the market for only a short time."

But the provision of additional lamps was not the only improvement at Smithfield. A rule was made, at the suggestion of the Society's solicitor, that no sticks were to be used in driving cattle except those stamped and signed by the Corporation. Formerly the drovers used formidable bludgeons, by which many a leg was broken and many an eye knocked out. The City Police were also instructed to prevent cruelty to the cattle in Smithfield Market as far as possible, and in all flagrant cases to bring the offenders to punishment.

It was at this time that Robert Batson, a member of the Society's committee, devised a special cart for the conveyance of calves to market. The Society had heard of a man who tied the legs of some calves closely together and then loaded a cart with them in such a way that the calves' heads hung down over the edge of the cart.

Mention is made in the 1837 report of cruelties to birds. The birds' eyes were put out to make them better songsters. "Legislation cannot reach such

cases," said the speaker, but there he was wrong, for the Society, aided by the law, has suppressed that form of cruelty; such cases are now very rare.

The same speaker—he must have been specially fond of birds—thus referred to cruelty to pigeons:

"It has for some time been the practice to employ pigeons to carry intelligence of the result of races and such matters; but lately they have been employed to carry the news of the state of French funds for the purpose of stock-jobbing. To prevent the news from reaching this country, persons have been stationed on the cliffs to shoot them as they come over. Thus is afforded another instance of cruelty for the purpose of forwarding the rapacity of man."

* * * * *

This brief glance at the records of the Society gives one a rough idea of the cruelties inflicted on the animals of this country when Princess Victoria, a girl of sixteen, came to their aid.

On her accession to the throne in 1837, Queen Victoria renewed her patronage of the Society, and in 1840, Her Majesty extended it by graciously permitting the Society to use the prefix "Royal." At the next annual meeting the following resolution was, with cheers, unanimously agreed to:

"That it is with sentiments of the most profound respect and loyalty that this meeting has received the announcement of the distinguished honour conferred by Her Most Gracious Majesty upon this Institution, by permitting it to assume the title of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and which has afforded an additional demonstration of her benevolent kindness towards the animal creation."

At a subsequent meeting, Earl Grosvenor* thus referred to this honour from the Queen :

“ In conferring honour on the Society, Her Majesty has also conferred honour upon herself, because she has been noble enough to declare through us to the world that she possesses feelings which dignify her as a woman while they exalt her as a monarch.”

The Society celebrated the accession of Queen Victoria by increasing its efforts on behalf of animals, and in 1837 the number of successful prosecutions was 270—double the number of the preceding year.

“ Every year,” said the chairman, the Earl of Carnarvon, at the annual meeting in 1838, “ shows us that our sincere efforts are at length beginning to be triumphant.” Equally welcome to the supporters of the Society was a little speech made by a magistrate at Ramsgate after he had disposed of a case of cruelty. The defendant had described an inspector as an “ informer.”

“ Rogerson is not an informer,” said the magistrate, “ but an officer acting under a Society, the existence of which is an honour to the nation ; and I tell you he shall receive every assistance and protection in the execution of his duty.”

It was at this time that the Society first realized the importance of educating the young to be kind to animals. A lady offered prizes to the boys of Charterhouse School for the two best essays on the principles of humanity to the brute creation, and the Society added a silver medal to the prizes. An anonymous friend of animals—a man—in Yorkshire offered £100 for a prize essay on “ The Moral Obligation of Man towards the Brute Creation ” ; the prize

* Afterwards first Duke of Westminster.

was won by Dr. Styles, and the Queen permitted the Society to dedicate the essay to her, and to publish it under the sanction of her name.

In 1839, the Society was able to report great improvement in the general condition of domestic animals and the treatment they received. The public were beginning to send in complaints of cruelty to animals, and the Society investigated all those "on which they thought they might rely." (The Society now attends to all complaints of cruelty to animals; the average number is about 250 a week.)

At the annual meeting of 1840, Sir George Chetwynd mentioned that the first sermon ever preached in a church in aid of the Society had been preached at his suggestion in the church of Grendon, near Atherstone, Warwickshire, and the sermon had been followed by a collection for the Society, the first of its kind. In that collection was a farthing, contributed by a poor widow "who (we quote the report) would not depart from the church without contributing her mite to the cause of humanity."

A very important change in part of the policy of the Society was made in 1841. In that year, the committee decided not to accept any portion of the penalties which might be awarded them in cases of cruelty, but to leave the money to be applied to charities, as the magistrates might direct. To this decision the Society has always adhered; it never benefits by the penalties inflicted on offenders whom it has brought to justice.

* * * * *

We need not trace in detail the gradual change in the attitude of the public towards animals. This

change was directly due to the good example set to her subjects by Queen Victoria, who, even when weighed down by private grief or overwhelmed by the cares of State, still took an active interest in furthering the aims of the Society.

When the Society celebrated its Jubilee in 1874, Queen Victoria showed her great interest in the Society by sending the following letter to the Earl of Harrowby, President of the Society :

“ BUCKINGHAM PALACE,
“ *June 10, 1874.*

“ MY DEAR LORD,

“ The Queen has commanded me to address you as President of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, on the occasion of the assemblage in this country of the foreign delegates connected with similar associations, and of the jubilee of the Society, to request you to give expression publicly of Her Majesty's warm interest in the success of the efforts which are being made here and abroad for the purpose of diminishing the cruelties practised on dumb animals.

“ The Queen hears and reads with horror of the sufferings which the brute creation often undergo from the thoughtlessness of the ignorant, and she fears also sometimes from experiments in the pursuit of science. For the removal of the former, the Queen trusts much to the progress of education; and in regard to the pursuit of science, she hopes that the entire advantage of those anæsthetic discoveries from which man has derived so much benefit himself, in the alleviation of suffering, may be fully extended to the lower animals.

"Her Majesty rejoices that the Society awakens the interest of the young by the presentation of prizes for essays connected with the subject, and hears with gratification that her son and daughter-in-law show their interest and sympathy by presenting those prizes at your meeting. Her Majesty desires me to announce a donation of one hundred guineas towards the funds of the Society.

"I am, my dear Lord,

"Very faithfully yours,

"T. M. BIDDULPH.

"THE EARL OF HARROWBY, K.G., etc."

This letter was read at the Jubilee meeting of the Society in the Albert Hall. Some years before this meeting, the Society had inaugurated annual essay competitions among the children of London and the country, the subject of the essays being the duty of kindness to animals. Prizes for the best essays were presented publicly. On this occasion the prizes were presented by the Duchess of Edinburgh.

The Duke of Edinburgh, in the course of his reply to the vote of thanks, said :

"I need add no words to the letter from the Queen to assure you of the interest which all members of the Royal Family feel in the welfare of dumb animals, and the encouragement by exertion we should all make to secure them as our friends and to show them all possible kindness."

The Society has had many proofs—many given privately, others in public—"of the interest which all members of the Royal Family feel in the welfare of dumb animals."

At various times the prizes in the Society's annual

essay competitions have been presented by Queen Mary (once when the Duchess of York and once when the Princess of Wales), by Queen Alexandra (when Princess of Wales), Princess Christian, the Duchess of Albany, Princess Beatrice (three times), and the Princess Royal.

Queen Victoria's interest in the Society and its work never flagged. At the close of 1876, Her Majesty gave the Society a photograph of herself and Princess Beatrice for reproduction in the *Animal World*, the official magazine of the Society, and for sale afterwards in aid of the Society's funds. In December, 1881, Her Majesty wrote to Lord Aberdare, President of the Society, asking if it would be possible for the Society to take any steps with regard to the houghing of cattle and other horrible practices on dumb animals which were occurring frequently in Ireland.

When Princess Beatrice first presented the prizes at the Society's annual meeting (August, 1882), the Queen sent a message expressing her pleasure that the Princess should give her countenance to a cause "in which Her Majesty takes a very great interest."

By command of Queen Victoria, the Society prepared a medal, to be known as the "Queen's Medal," for presentation to some of its conspicuous workers. The design of the medal was submitted to the Queen, who, noticing that there was no cat among the animals depicted upon it, directed that a cat should be placed in the foreground, and sketched one on the design. She explained that it was time the Royal Family did something to change the general feeling of aversion to and contempt for cats. At the same time Her Majesty wrote to the Society stating that she would



QUEEN VICTORIA AND PRINCESS BEATRICE WITH THEIR
FAVOURITE DOGS.

From a photograph presented by Her Majesty to the Society.



THE QUEEN'S MEDAL.

To face p. 94.

be very glad if the Society could do something for the protection and safety of cats, which were generally misunderstood and grossly ill-treated. The first "Queen's Medal" was, by command of the Queen, presented to John Colam, Secretary of the Society.

Speaking at the annual meeting of the Society in 1886, Lord Aberdare, the President, said he could not exaggerate the advantage which the countenance of the Royal Family had been to the Society.

"The Society," he added, "does not possess a more active member than the Queen herself. Many things that escape less observant eyes attract her attention, and prove her to be a vigilant apostle of humanity."

Early in 1887, the Society sent an address of loyal congratulation to the Queen on the completion of the fiftieth year of her reign, to which the Queen replied :

"It gives me great satisfaction to receive your loyal and dutiful address of congratulations on the completion of the fiftieth year of my reign.

"Amongst other marks of the spread of enlightenment amongst my subjects, I notice in particular, with real pleasure, the growth of more humane feelings towards the lower animals; no civilization is complete which does not include the dumb and defenceless of God's creatures within the sphere of charity and mercy.

"The labours of your Society have done much to promote this moral progress; and, for the sake alike of human nature and of the happiness of the animal creation by which we are surrounded, I trust that you will steadily persevere in your noble aims, in which you will continue to have my warm and entire sympathy."

In that year the Queen assisted the Society by condemning the fashion of using small birds as trimming for hats. Her Majesty also showed her continued interest in the work of the Society by coming to the annual meeting at the Albert Hall and presenting the prizes. Her Majesty afterwards gave a photograph of herself to each of the prize-winners, and expressed the wish that the Society would present a book-marker to every scholar who had won prizes in the Jubilee year and to every school master and mistress in whose school a competition had been held.

Unlike many people who are greatly attached to cats, Queen Victoria was equally fond of dogs. It was in accordance with her wish that dogs are kept at the Battersea Dogs' Home for two days longer than the time provided by law.

Queen Victoria was intensely interested in the welfare of all animals. The following passage in the recently published "Life of Sir William Harcourt" caused no surprise to those who remembered, with heartfelt gratitude, Her Majesty's concern for the well-being of all living creatures :

"Harcourt replied that he had already arranged an interview with Sir James Paget and Sir William Gull for the purpose of discussing the question of vivisection, and would later submit some observations on the subject. He had already informed the Queen that instructions had been given for the rigorous enforcement of the existing law with regard to vivisection, and that the limit set to the practice should be restricted rather than extended. Ponsonby was also asked by the Queen (June 30, 1880) to say that she 'takes the greatest interest in the protection of

wild birds, and trusts therefore that the Bill, which I understand is to be brought into the House to-morrow, will receive support.' Harcourt replied that he believed it would be a useful measure and a proper correction for the cruelties now so often practised and the destruction of rare and beautiful species by unauthorized persons. 'The object of the Bill,' he said, 'is to prevent vagrant bird catchers from coming on to the land and killing and catching birds without leave of the owners or occupiers.' "

The Duke of Cambridge, who was one of the early patrons of the Society, presided at the annual meeting of 1845, when he expressed his conviction that the Society was "of infinite use."

"I can well remember the time, now very many years ago," said the Duke, "when this subject was first talked about, and when it was designated as madness on the part of those who had undertaken it."

Replying to a vote of thanks, the Duke said that as long as he lived he should always be ready to promote the best interests of the Society to the utmost of his power.

On May 6, 1863, King Edward and Queen Alexandra (then Prince and Princess of Wales) consented to become patrons of the Society. In a letter to the Society the Prince expressed "the high opinion that the Princess and he entertained of the merits of the Society, and of the beneficial results that have attended its exertions in this country, and the noble example which it has set to other nations."

The Prince and Princess gave proof of their continued interest in the Society by consenting to be present at the annual meeting in 1880 at the St.

James's Hall, when they were accompanied by Prince Albert Victor and Prince George. The Princess had graciously permitted the Society to state her special reason for consenting to be present at the meeting. The Princess wished to testify her sympathy with the work of the Ladies' Committee of the Society; this committee was chiefly concerned with the task of teaching children to be kind to animals.

On this occasion, the Princess presented the prizes to the winners in the essay competitions, and the Prince of Wales, responding to a vote of thanks moved by the President, Lord Aberdare, said :

"I am desired by the Princess to express her sincere acknowledgment to Lord Aberdare for the kind manner in which he has just spoken, and her thanks to this large assembly for the way in which it has just received the noble lord's proposal.

"Amongst the many important public duties which the Princess has to perform, and in the discharge of which I have occasionally to assist, I feel convinced there is none which could have possibly afforded her or myself more sincere interest or satisfaction than the pleasing ceremony in which we have taken part to-day.

"I look upon the Society as one of the great philanthropic societies of this country, and I think our thanks are due to those who take an active part in its management, and especially to the President of the Ladies' Committee, the Baroness Burdett-Coutts. I do not think they could have undertaken a more useful work than inviting the children of the schools of the Metropolis, and their younger teachers, to compete in the writing of essays on the duty of kindness to animals. The results cannot but be regarded as most

satisfactory, when out of the schools of London about 350 have competed and have produced about 15,000 essayists.

“ I feel sure that great good will have been done in the development of right feelings towards the animal creation among the children who are attending those schools. The conductors of our educational establishments will more and more recognize that it is one of their great duties to imbue the minds of the young with the consciousness that, besides showing kindness and gentleness to their fellow-creatures, they ought also to show kindness and gentleness to the brute creation, to which we owe so much. The more this is taught, the more this feeling is inculcated, the more rapidly will the objects of this excellent Society be accomplished, and the more certainly will the time arrive, as we hope it may, when the range of its duties will be greatly diminished.

“ I beg, once more, in the name of the Princess, to thank you for your reception of to-day, and to assure you that the ceremony we have taken part in is one we are not likely to forget, and that we shall always continue to take the deepest interest in this excellent Society.”

The last sentence of the Prince's speech was not merely a graceful compliment to the Society. The Prince afterwards made many useful suggestions to the Society, and aided its work by his expression of his disapproval of the customs of dubbing gamecocks, cropping the ears of dogs, and docking the tails of horses. One of the first of King Edward's acts on coming to the throne was to abolish the Royal Buckhounds. The pack had been in existence for 700

years, but His Majesty disapproved of the hunting of tame deer. The Society had supported the efforts of the Rev. W. Stratton, chairman of the committee of the Humanitarian League, to bring about this notable reform. Only a few months before his death, King Edward ordered an inquiry to be made into the deplorable condition of the traffic in decrepit horses between this country and the Continent.

Queen Alexander, a life member of the Society, has aided its work in many ways. As Princess of Wales, she placed herself at the head of a movement to put down pigeon-shooting at Hurlingham. A number of ladies, under the leadership of the Princess, signified their intention of discountenancing the sport by their absence from meetings at the club where live pigeons were shot at.

Her Majesty has also graciously assisted the Society by her frequent expressions of disapproval of the wearing of osprey and other feathers, of the use of bearing reins, and of the mutilation of animals. The public has thus had many proofs of Queen Alexandra's warm interest in the Society's work, but the Society has had many others which have been given privately, and which, by Her Majesty's wishes, have never been disclosed. In May, 1902, in the course of a letter expressing regret that she could not attend the Society's annual prize-giving, owing to the coronation, Her Majesty wrote :

"I am always interested in the work of the Society, and would have been glad to assist this year if it had been possible."

During the Great War, Queen Alexandra was specially interested in the work undertaken by the

Society in aid of sick and wounded war horses, and assisted it again and again. The public were made aware of only a few of Her Majesty's many kindly acts in aid of the special war fund of the Society.

At the first meeting of the Council of the Society following the death of King Edward, a letter of condolence was sent to Queen Alexandra, King George, and Queen Mary.

Their Majesties' reply was :

"I am to assure you of Her Majesty Queen Alexandra's warm appreciation of the unremitting labours of the Society for the protection of animals from unnecessary suffering.

"His Majesty the King renews the zealous sympathy which King Edward felt for the work of the Society and for the cause they have championed with increasing effect."

The Society had already had many proofs of King George's interest in its work. As a boy he had accompanied the Prince and Princess of Wales to the annual meeting of the Society in 1880.

In 1893, His Majesty (then Duke of York) graciously consented to be President of the Society in succession to Lord Aberdare, and in thus honouring the Society became its first Royal President. In reply to an address presented by the Council of the Society, the Duke replied :

"I feel it is a great honour to succeed so distinguished a man as Lord Aberdare, and I am proud to be connected with an institution which has for its object the prevention of unnecessary pain and suffering to animals. I assure you I will do all in my power to assist you in your labours."

Queen Mary (then Duchess of York) honoured the Society by presenting the prizes at the annual meeting in 1895, and the Duke, replying to the thanks of the children, said :

“ I am proud of being President of this great Society.”

Their Royal Highnesses aided the Society in a similar way in 1907.

Some years ago, Queen Mary, following the example of Queen Alexandra, made known her views on the subject of fashionable plumage. Her Majesty said that she had read letters on the subject of ospreys and had given special instructions that nothing of the kind was to be used in her millinery. (The importation of such feathers is now prohibited by the Plumage Act.)

Their Majesties have frequently given proofs, publicly and privately, of their keen interest in the work of the Society, and especially in the Society's efforts to bring about a reform in the method of slaughtering animals for food. It is by the King's command that steel traps are not allowed to be used on the Royal estates.

In 1918, the Prince of Wales graciously consented to become a patron of the Society, and later in the year His Royal Highness further honoured the Society by accepting the office of President. The Prince is also patron of the branches of the Society in Cornwall, in which he takes a special interest.

All the members of the Royal Family are now patrons of the Society.

We desire to close this chapter with an expression of the Society's grateful remembrance of many kindly actions performed privately by members of the Royal

Family on behalf of animals, actions which may not be described here, but which, if they were known to the public, would show that this is indeed a "Royal" Society, and that of the many friends of animals in this country none are more kind, more considerate, and more helpful than the members of the Royal Family.

CHAPTER VII

THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO DOGS

To any inquiring reader who asks why dogs should have a chapter in this book to themselves we tender the following reasons :

1. The dog was probably the first animal to be domesticated, and he has been known, from time immemorial, as the friend of man.
2. The dog is still the most popular of all animals.
3. In the Dark Days more cruelties were practised on dogs than on any other animal.
4. The dog was the last of the domestic animals to receive the full protection of the law.

Some amends are due to dogs, but if those reasons are not regarded as being sufficient for giving to dogs the honour of a separate chapter we have still another—our trump card. Here it is :

We are very fond of dogs.

If it were possible for dogs to ape one of the fashions of the day and hold solemn conferences they would probably discuss their owners and would come to the conclusion that human beings can be divided into three classes : (1) People who are kind to dogs ; (2) People who are unkind by being over-kind to dogs ; (3) People who are cruel to dogs—until the R.S.P.C.A. hears about them.

The great majority of people belong to the first class, about which we need not say anything.

There have always been persons who have been unkind by being over-kind to their dogs. In an

account of English dogs contributed by William Harrison to Holinshed's *Chronicles* (sixteenth century) he refers to toy dogs, as they are now called, and says :

“The smaller they be the better they are accepted, the more pleasure they provoke, as meet playfellows for mincing mistresses to bear in their bosoms, to keep company withal in their chambers, to succour with sleep in bed, and nourish with meat at board, to lie in their laps, and lick their lips as they lie (like young Dianas) in their waggons and coaches. . . . Yea, they oft feed them of the best, where the poor man's child at their doors can hardly come by the worst.”

We pass over three centuries.

In 1850 the Society was trying to prevent dogs from being used as beasts of burden, and at the annual meeting of that year dogs formed the chief subject of discussion. One man pointed out that there was a great deal of cruelty to dogs even in kindness. He said he had occasionally observed dogs so fat that their “respiration was embarrassed,” and the difficulty they had in walking was increased by the kindness they had received. He had occasionally observed a footman kicking one of those fat animals for the purpose only of moving him to walk after his mistress.

The moral is obvious, and it is just as necessary to point it out to-day as it was in 1850.

We turn to less excusable forms of cruelty to dogs. For upwards of two centuries dogs of a very lowly breed, known as “turnspits,” helped to cook the dinners of the people. A “turnspit” was a long-bodied dog with short, crooked legs. He was put

into a small wheel attached to the cooking apparatus which held the joint, and by the action of running (and woe betide him if he stopped!) he made the wheel revolve; the spit, holding the joint, turned slowly before the fire.

Gay (1688-1732) tells us in a little poem, "The Turnspit Taught," how these unfortunate little dogs liked their job and how the cooks of the day treated them.

"The dinner must be dished at once.
Where's this vexatious turnspit gone?
Unless the skulking cur is caught,
The sirloin's spoilt, and I'm in fault."
'Thus said (for sure you'll think it fit
That I the cook-maid's oaths omit),
With all the fury of a cook,
Her cooler kitchen Nan forsook :
The broom-stick o'er her head she waves,
She sweats, she stamps, she puffs, she raves—
The sneaking cur before her flies;
She whistles, calls, fair speech she tries;
These nought avail. Her choler burns :
The fist and cudgel threat by turns.
With hasty stride she presses near;
He slinks aloof, and howls with fear.
"Was ever cur so cursed (he cried)!
What star did at my birth preside!
Am I for life by compact bound
To tread the wheel's eternal round?
Inglorious task! Of all our race
No slave is half so mean and base."

The turnspit points out how much happier he would have been if he had been a lapdog or a spaniel, and is then reminded that his lot in life is better than that of another animal.

An ox by chance o'erheard his moan
And thus rebuked the lazy drone;
"You by the duties of your post
Shall turn the spit when I'm the roast;
And for reward shall share the feast—
I mean shall pick my bones at least."

"Till now (th' astonished cur replies)
I looked on all with envious eyes . . .
Let envy then no more torment :
Think on the ox, and learn content."
Thus said, close following at her heel,
With cheerful heart he mounts the wheel.

But there must have been thousands of turnspits in those days whose hearts were far from cheerful.

These little dogs were still used in the kitchens in the early part of the nineteenth century, but the Society was not called upon to suppress that form of cruelty to dogs; it ceased when roasting jacks came into use.

The Rev. Henry Crowe, who wrote "Zoophilus, A Consideration of the Moral Treatment of Inferior Animals" in 1822 (two years before the Society was founded) and dedicated it to Lord Erskine, refers to the sufferings of turnspit dogs, and the "cunning trick" they had of hiding when they were wanted. He says :

"I shall dwell but briefly on a use to which dogs, called turnspits, were formerly much applied, hoping that it will soon be totally discontinued, as it is now nearly so. . . .

"Enclosed in a wheel from which they cannot escape, overcome by a labour which admits of no pause (indeed the lash prevents any), and oppressed by the heat of the stove, their fate is well nigh that of Ixion, except that he was not doomed to toil by a fireside in hot weather. A kitchen joke, too, I understand, is, if they are lazy, to put into the wheel a hot coal as a stimulant to their feet; and this is said to be the method of teaching them originally their business. . . . Roasting jacks of various constructions are now everywhere common and cheap."

But although the use of dogs as turnspits was dying out, other forms of cruelty to dogs prevailed in the early part of the nineteenth century. Thus, in the preface to a book of anecdotes about dogs, by Joseph Taylor, published in 1804, we have this :

“ I have long been a painful observer of the great cruelties which the brute creation frequently undergo, and particularly the dog, who is the subject of the present work. It is but too obvious that young people repeatedly, from incaution and not knowing their generous nature, inflict severe punishment on these kind creatures, which Divine Providence has been pleased to make subservient to us, without once considering how necessary they are, as links of the grand chain of the universe, for our assistance, amusement, and very frequently our preservation. I have, therefore, as the friend of that truly generous animal, whose merits I am proud to rehearse, completed with great pains, and at some expense, a volume of Canine Anecdotes in hopes that the various instances of sagacity and faithful attachment which I have introduced will prevent, in some measure, the future ill-treatment of merit so transcendent. This idea, even in anticipation, affords me much pleasure; and if my humble efforts meet your approbation, I shall conceive it a favourable omen, and flatter myself that an undertaking, founded on the abhorrence of barbarity, may not be found altogether undeserving the notice of benevolent beings, who wish to exterminate cruelty from a Christian land.”

At the time that those lines were written, and for thirty-one years afterwards, there was no law for the protection of dogs. Any man possessed of a

devil could torture his dog in any way that pleased him.

It is certainly strange that there was no legal protection for dogs until 1835, because some measure which would have been of benefit to dogs might also have allayed the alarm of the public regarding hydrophobia. There were several well-founded "scares" of hydrophobia in the early part of the nineteenth century, and more than one attempt was made to pass a Bill "to prevent the spreading of canine madness." On one of these occasions (February 8, 1831) it was stated that in the previous summer four hundred cases of rabid dogs had been heard of within a very brief space of time, and eighty had come to the knowledge of one individual.

That measure was lost in the Commons, but another attempt was made to introduce a similar Bill later in the year. One speaker gently taunted the House with being "more disposed to favour brute animals than the human species."

The second reading of that Bill was deferred twenty-one times, and after the prorogation of Parliament in October nothing more was heard of it. The country was thinking more about the Reform Bill than about hydrophobia.

While these "scares" prevailed stray dogs were cleared off the streets by the police. Local by-laws contained provisions dealing with stray dogs. In 1835 *The Times* was able to announce that under the Grosvenor Local Act the streets of the parish of St. George's, Hanover Square, had been completely cleared of dogs. The keepers of Hyde Park took a hand in the task of getting rid of dogs suspected of being mad, and on one day they shot seven in

the Park; a question was asked about this in the House.

The Act of 1835 nominally protected dogs from cruelty, but it really did very little for them and left untouched the chief form of cruelty—the employment of dogs as beasts of burden. Dogs were worked in this way because they were much cheaper than horses, ponies, and donkeys, because they cost little to keep, and because a dog-cart paid no tolls on the road. Apparently the custom of employing dogs to draw carts had not long existed in this country. A letter drawing attention to “a new species of cruelty” appeared in the *European Magazine* of July, 1809. The writer describes “trucks drawn by dogs,” and adds that the dogs are usually “two mastiffs of the largest size and most ferocious nature; and these poor animals are, by the ‘human beast’ who walks behind and exercises his whip or, perhaps, goad *ad libitum*, impelled along the streets to the terror and danger of His Majesty’s subjects. This you must allow, Mr. Editor, is a most horrid and barbarous practice. . . .” The writer was really as much concerned with the danger to the public as with the sufferings of the dogs.

There was no doubt that by the Act of 1835 the dog was one of the animals which were not to be wantonly and cruelly beaten, ill-treated, abused, or tortured, and in January, 1836, Robert Batson, a member of the Society’s committee, prosecuted a man for ill-treating three dogs in a cart.

The man, the cart, and the dogs were taken to Lambeth Police Court, and the magistrate inspected the dogs; they were half-starved and covered with sores. Having thanked Robert Batson for bringing

the case, the magistrate sentenced the defendant to fourteen days' imprisonment. He must have been the first man to be punished for being cruel to dogs.

Batson bought the three dogs on whose behalf he had taken action and found good homes for two of them; the third was very ill and had to be destroyed.

Some of the men prosecuted by the Society for cruelty to the dogs they used in carts got off very lightly. In one case it was shown that a single dog had been made to pull a load of five hundred pounds at the rate of twelve miles an hour. The dog had been urged on until it had dropped from exhaustion. The driver was fined ten shillings and costs.

In its report for 1837 the Society drew attention to the numerous instances of gross cruelty to the "poor, overladen, cruelly beaten, and half-starved dogs," and at the annual meeting of that year the President, the Earl of Carnarvon, said that dogs were "seen dying under the lash." In some parts of the country the dogs were let out to children at the rate of a penny a day, and the hirers of the dogs had to feed them. One can imagine the size of the rations.

The Society petitioned Parliament and suggested that the names and addresses of the owners of the dogs should be put on the carts. Any attempt to suppress this cruelty by making it illegal to use a dog as a beast of burden was met with the objection that to do that would be to deprive many persons of their means of living.

The attention of the public was directed to the sufferings of these dogs by evidence given before a Parliamentary committee appointed in 1838 to inquire into the provisions of the Metropolitan Police Officers Bill. Mr. W. Sewell, assistant professor at the Royal

Veterinary College, said he was certain that the ill-treatment of dogs "in trucks" frequently caused madness. He attributed the "somewhat more frequent occurrence of the disease in recent years" to the over-exertion of dogs in carts, which brought on fever and exposed them to rabies from the pain and irritation of the feet. He "most decidedly considered" that the dog was unfit to be a beast of burden, and that his being so employed was a cruel act.

Other experts gave similar evidence, and in the following year (1839) a clause was inserted into the Metropolitan Police Act forbidding the use of dogs as beasts of burden in the Metropolitan Police area (within a radius of fifteen miles from Charing Cross).

The costermongers of London immediately got up a petition to Parliament to repeal the clause. They stated that their kindness to their dogs was well known, that this Society punished offenders, and that their trade would be "knocked up" as they could not afford to keep horses.

Public opinion was on the side of the dogs; people were learning to be kind to animals. On one occasion when a dog-cart was stopped because of the cruelty to the two dogs drawing it, a crowd gathered round and were so indignant that a woman who had been riding in the cart jumped down and ran away. The two dogs had drawn a load of six hundredweight in addition to the woman, and they had been beaten with a heavy chain attached to the cart in such a manner that it could be used as a whip without attracting attention.

Parliament ignored the costermongers' appeal, and the new regulation prohibiting the use of dogs as beasts of burden in London came into force on

January 1, 1840. During that year only one attempt to evade the law was discovered.

The Society immediately tried to get the law extended to the whole kingdom, but failed again and again, although it was known that the dogs in the country carts were also brutally ill-used. Thus, when the Society prosecuted a man at Gosport for wanton cruelty to two dogs in a cart, the bench said that the inhabitants of the district were greatly indebted to the Society for interfering to prevent the disgusting scenes of brutality to poor dogs constantly occurring on the coast. The danger occasioned by half-rabid dogs driven by reckless men at a speed exceeding that of the fleetest horse could only be estimated by those who had suffered inconvenience from it.

The "inconvenience" referred to was the attitude of horses to dog-carts. Apparently horses could not be persuaded to take kindly to the appearance of carts drawn by dogs, and accidents were constantly occurring. Yet the new regulation, which had prohibited dog-carts in London, did not please everyone. Someone wrote to *The Times* pointing out the nuisance likely to arise owing to "the suburbs being now overrun with large, fierce dogs belonging to bakers and others which are let loose in the public roads to the great annoyance and terror of passengers."

No one took any notice of the letter. The Society continued its work on behalf of the dogs used in carts outside London. Two or three of its members were in Parliament, and so there was no difficulty in introducing a Bill (July, 1840) to prohibit the use of dogs as draught animals all over England.

The Bill was opposed on the ground that such a

measure would inflict hardship on poor men who could not afford to keep horses or donkeys, and the Bill was withdrawn. In the following year a similar Bill passed through the Commons, but was thrown out by the Lords.

We interrupt the account of the emancipation of dogs to record a little event, of interest to all lovers of dogs, which occurred in the summer of 1841. A tradesman of Fleet Street put a pan of water, for the use of thirsty dogs, outside the door of his shop. He was the first man to show such consideration for dogs.

One of many persons who must have noticed that pan of water wrote to *The Times* about it (July 6, 1841):

“Whilst passing through Fleet Street a few days since I observed placed under the pastycook’s shop window next St. Dunstan’s Church a pan of water, and affixed to it the following humane notice, ‘For Dogs.’

“Now, though we have heard of and seen many wonderful ‘initial-finding’ and ‘calculating’ dogs, as well as pigs and horses, I do not recollect ever hearing of one that could actually read. No doubt, however, the sense of sight of all the unlearned as well as the ‘learned’ of the faithful race is good; and for humanity’s sake to the animals and the prevention of fearful accidents to our own race during the now commenced dog-days, I respectfully suggest, through the medium of your widely extended journal, the adoption of the plan by all parochial authorities and tradesmen, care, of course, being taken that it be no obstruction to the passengers.”

In February, 1843, still another effort was made to prevent dogs from being used as beasts of burden

throughout the country. A Bill introduced into the Commons was opposed on the ground that it was an "arbitrary and an aristocratic measure" which would deprive a large number of poor traders of their means of living. But opposition to this reform was weakening. On the third reading of the Bill one of its opponents could think of no better argument against it than this: "If the Bill passes it will only substitute one evil for another; some animals must be employed to run the carts." The speaker added that he had heard of a person who employed a goose to clean his chimney, and on being reproved for doing so thought he had made a great advance in humanity by using two geese.

The Bill passed through the Commons. Lord Wicklow, moving the second reading in the Lords, said that instances had been known of dogs who drew carts heavily laden with goods from Brighton to Portsmouth in one day, and returned the following day—a distance of about sixty miles. Numbers of accidents had occurred through horses taking fright at the dog-carts.

Lord Campbell attempted to ridicule the Bill and was rebuked by Lord Carnarvon (President of the Society), who said that the time had gone by when remarks of that sort, distasteful to a large portion of the community, could be made with any effect. The Bill was loudly called for by humanity.

But the Bill was lost in the Lords. That the subject was in the minds of the public is shown by a little joke printed on the programme of the Haymarket Theatre at this time:

"The public is respectfully informed that the little dog mentioned in the original story has been omitted,

for fear the animal's attractions might render the manager liable to the penalties under the 2nd and 3rd Vic., c. 47, sec. 56, by which it is enacted that no person within the district of the Metropolitan Police shall use any dog for the purpose of drawing or helping to draw, etc."

In 1849 an Act was passed "for the more effectual prevention of cruelty to animals," but it did not prohibit the use of dogs as beasts of burden. At the next annual meeting of the Society the Bishop of Oxford pleaded for renewed efforts to suppress this form of cruelty, but for some time the Society had to be content with prosecuting offenders. They could do no more than that.

In June, 1854, when another Bill "for the more effectual prevention of cruelty to animals" had reached the committee stage, Sir James East, a member of the Society's committee, moved the addition of a clause to the effect that no person should, in any part of the United Kingdom, use any dog for the purpose of drawing or helping to draw any cart, carriage, truck, or barrow.

The Bill passed through the Commons with that clause in it. The Lords objected to the clause on the grounds that it would be the means of hanging 20,000 dogs, that it was a piece of uncalled-for legislation, and that it would confiscate the property of a large number of the very poorest of the community.

The Bishop of Oxford won the day for the Society. He pointed out that the custom of employing dogs to draw carts existed chiefly in Sussex and Hampshire. It was remarkable, he said, that in those parts of the country where the people had been brought into daily

contact with the system there was a very general desire that the law which prohibited the use of dog-carts in London should be extended to the districts where dog-carts were used. The town councils of Portsmouth, Southampton, Newport (Isle of Wight), Winchester, and Salisbury had made by-laws prohibiting the use of dog-carts in their respective boundaries.

There was one simple reason, added the Bishop, why a man might be more cruel to a dog than to a pony. The price of a dog was very low as compared with that of a pony, and with men of hardened feeling that would be sufficient motive to induce them to ill-treat a dog when they would not act in the same way towards a pony.

He had been informed that in those parts of the country where dog-carts prevailed the poor animals had been traced in some instances a distance of twenty miles by their blood-stained feet marks on the road, and that it was no unusual thing for a dog to be driven forty or fifty miles upon a hard road till it was able to go no further, to be then destroyed, and have its place taken by a new dog.

The Bill was passed with the clause in it, but the law did not come into force until January 1, 1855. Thus the Society had been engaged for fifteen years in bringing about this much needed reform.

After the Act had been passed the Society's inspectors visited all the districts where dogs had been used in great numbers, and the Society sent circulars to the police throughout the kingdom asking for their assistance in seeing that the new law was carried into effect. In their report of 1855 the committee were able to state that, to the best of their

belief, there was not a single dog employed to draw a cart or other vehicle on any public roadway in the kingdom.

No sooner was this form of cruelty to dogs suppressed than another kind of brutality was perpetrated or—perhaps it would be more correct to say—revived. We refer to the cropping of dogs' ears.

When bull-baiting was made illegal dog-fighting was substituted as an amusement for the people, and all fighting dogs had their ears cropped. The object of cutting away part of the ears of a fighting dog was to lessen his chance of being held by the ear in a fight.

Dog-fighting having been suppressed, there was no reason why dogs should have their ears cropped, but the dog "fanciers" of the time continued the custom and invented a reason for it. They held that cropping improved the appearance of dogs of certain breeds.

This wicked notion had prevailed for some years. Thus, in Blaine's "Canine Pathology," published in 1841, we read :

"This custom (cropping) is one that does not honour the inventor; it may readily be asserted that nature gives nothing in vain. . . . The cropping of pug puppies is the most painful of any; the cuts must, in general, be repeated, and carried close to the root of the ear; as upon the total absence of external ears (which gives an appearance of roundness to the head) is the beauty of the animal supposed to consist. . . . It is not a little surprising that this cruel custom should be so invariably practised on pug dogs, whose ears are particularly handsome, and hang very gracefully."

William Youatt, veterinary surgeon to the Society,

and an authority on dogs, naturally objected to cropping. In his book on "The Dog," published in 1845, he said :

"The effects of this absurd amputation do not cease with the healing of the ear. The intense inflammation that we have set up materially injures the internal structure of this organ. Deafness is frequently produced by it in some dogs, and constantly in others. The frequent deafness of the pug is solely attributable to the outrageous as well as absurd rounding of the ears."

Soon after the passing of the law which prohibited the use of dogs as beasts of burden people began to pay more attention to the appearance of dogs. The first dog show was held in 1859, and was soon followed by others. With greater public interest in well-bred dogs came an increase in the custom of cropping the ears of dogs of certain breeds.

There had never been any doubt, since the passing of the Act of 1835 protecting dogs, that the practice of cropping dogs' ears was illegal, but detection of the offence was not easy. No action could be taken against a man for owning a cropped dog.

Magistrates did not always encourage the Society to prosecute for this form of cruelty. On one occasion, when the Society summoned two persons for cropping a bull terrier, the magistrate said he "had often seen it done and did not regard it as an act of cruelty." But even this magistrate had to fine people who had broken the law. The fine in this case was sixpence.

One of the dog-cropping prosecutions of the Society in 1869 was made specially interesting to lovers of dogs by the evidence given at the police court by

Sir Edwin Landseer, who was a vice-president of the Society. He said he had invariably refused to paint a cropped dog or a docked horse. He considered that dogs were injured by cropping in point of health and beauty, and the owners were not benefited by the operation.

At one of the early dog shows Sir Edwin Landseer, who was one of the judges, wanted to exclude all mutilated dogs, but as the exhibitors had not been warned he could not press the point. He suggested, however, that at no future exhibition should any dog with cropped ears or otherwise mutilated be admitted. An anonymous correspondent wrote to *The Times* putting forward Sir Edwin's objection to the cropping of dogs' ears; the letter was replied to by a man who upheld the practice, and this was followed by an article in the same strain in the *Field*.

Sir Edwin Landseer replied to this article in a letter to *The Times* in which he said that he had no prejudice against cropping; he thought the writer who suggested it in the *Field* would be much improved by the operation, "as it is quite evident his ears are absurdly long; possibly it might have the effect of giving him the knowing appearance he desires to produce in dogs. If the article in the *Field* represents the views of the dog fancy, it is quite clear that they are in vulgar ignorance of the outward beauties of the various breeds of dogs and unable to appreciate the ways and high qualities of the noble animal. . . . Once for all I protest against this barbarous custom."

Speaking at the annual meeting of the Society in 1870 Sir Edwin Landseer told a story of "one of the proudest moments of my life." In Regent Street he had got into conversation with a man who had two

puppies, one under each arm. He said to the man : " I see they are not cropped."

The man replied : " Sir Edwin Landseer says they ought not to be cropped."

" I don't know why it was," added Sir Edwin, in relating the story, " but I felt extremely flattered by this, and felt I had done something for the cause."

In that year the Society successfully prosecuted five persons for cropping dogs' ears. The number may seem small, but it was very difficult to discover the actual offenders. Dogs of the following breeds were always mutilated in this way : Black and Tan terriers (Manchesters and Toys), bull terriers, white English terriers, Irish terriers, Yorkshire terriers, and Great Danes. Men who kept show dogs of any of these breeds ignored the law. Humane people protested occasionally against the brutal fashion, and whenever it was possible to do so the Society prosecuted offenders, but the practice was continued.

Early in 1884 an article protesting against the severe torture to which dogs were put solely because of the fashion appeared in the *Field*, which was then edited by " Stonehenge " (J. H. Walsh), one of the first authorities of the day on dogs; he had been one of the judges at the first dog show in 1859.

Possibly because of this article the Black and Tan Terrier Club inserted a notice in their rules warning members that cropping was illegal, but the notice had little or no effect.

" Stonehenge " repeated his protest against cropping in his book on " The Dog " published in 1887, and described in detail the tortures suffered by dogs when they were cropped. Referring to Manchester terriers he said :

“The ears are almost invariably cropped, and that in a way to cause great pain to the dog, not only at the time but for many weeks afterwards. In order to give a very sharp appearance the ‘leather’ is cut away almost level with the head, leaving a thin point standing up in a manner quite unnatural to the animal in any of his varieties. To do this requires a very good eye and some practice, but, however well the operation is done, the wound will contract and pucker the slip left if daily attention is not paid to it, by removing the scabs and stretching out the puckers; the thin and sharp point shrinks into an unsightly crumpled lump, and instead of an appearance being presented of greater sharpness than before, the reverse is exhibited. Hopes have been entertained of late years that this practice of cropping would be abandoned in the case of these terriers, as has been done with the pug, but I see no indications of such a happy result, and undoubtedly a Manchester terrier, however well made and marked, would be left out of the prize list by any of our judges if exhibited with his ears entire. The operation is not usually done till the puppy is six or seven months old, as until that time it is almost impossible to get the desired shape, and this makes it all the more painful, as by that time the cartilages have become hard and a sharp pair of scissors must be used with considerable force to cut through them.”

One little detail “Stonehenge” overlooked. No veterinary surgeon who valued his reputation would crop dogs; the operations were usually performed by unqualified men, who were not always skilful.

Early in 1889 the Kennel Club’s committee began to concern itself in bringing about the abolition of cropping, but little was done until 1895, when a letter

on the subject was addressed to the Prince of Wales, who was patron of the Club.

In his reply the Prince said that he had kept dogs for many years, and had frequently shown them at exhibitions, but he had never allowed any dog belonging to him to be mutilated. He had always been opposed to the practice, which he considered caused unnecessary suffering, and it would give him much pleasure to hear that owners of dogs had agreed to abandon such an objectionable fashion.

Meanwhile the Society, in the course of one of its prosecutions for cropping, had asked for a decision on the illegality of cropping as an undoubted form of cruelty. The magistrate went very fully into the question of cropping, and eventually fined each of the three defendants the full penalty—£5 and two guineas costs.

The Kennel Club then passed a rule that no dog born after March 31, 1895, nor any Irish terrier born after December 31, 1889, could, if cropped, win a prize at any show held under Kennel Club rules. Irish terrier fanciers had been to the front in helping to bring about this reform.

Thus it will be seen that our statement, in the opening of this chapter, that the dog was the last domestic animal to receive the benefit of full protection of the law is borne out by facts. The Act of 1835 should have put an end to the practice of cropping dogs' ears. Sixty years afterwards dogs were still being tortured in the name of fashion. Happily the custom is now dead.

We turn back for a moment to a brighter page in the history of the prevention of cruelty to dogs.

The Home for Lost and Starving Dogs at Batter-

sea was started in 1860. It was founded by Mrs. Tealby, of Islington, her brother, the Rev. Edward Bates, and Mrs. Major. While out for a walk one evening these two ladies came across a half-starved, homeless dog; they wished to befriend the dog, and so they took him home and made up a bed for him in their scullery.

These humane ladies afterwards tried to found a private refuge for dogs, but it was soon evident that the refuge would be too large an affair for private enterprise. An appeal was then made by means of a letter to the papers "to the humanity of the ladies of London and its environs in behalf of the numbers of lost and starving dogs that are seen in the streets and suburbs of the Metropolis."

The idea was new, and therefore somebody had to laugh at it. One man wrote to the papers suggesting the formation of a "Butterfly and Caterpillar Protection Society" for providing a home of refuge for starving butterflies and caterpillars of the suburban gardens. Another correspondent suggested that "the interesting innocents" at the home might be fattened and converted into sausages. *The Times*, in a leading article, was pleased to be facetious over the project of establishing a home for lost dogs.

"It is perfectly right that the Legislature should have distinctly forbidden that dogs should be used as beasts of draught," said *The Times*, "but when we hear of a 'Home for Dogs' we venture to doubt if the originators and supporters of such an institution have not taken leave of their sober senses. The thing, however, exists, and our only wonder must be that the secretary of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals should have consented to receive sub-

scriptions for such a purpose. . . . Why not a home for £5 notes dropped in the streets? Why not an office for the reception of valuable deposits without security or guarantee?"

And so on, but we need not push at an open door. Nowadays everyone knows of the good work done by the Dogs' Home. Following an appeal to the public for support, which was soon forthcoming, the first Home for Dogs was opened at Holloway. John Colam, then secretary of the R.S.P.C.A., took a great interest in the founding of the home and served on its first committee. Meetings of the supporters of the home are usually held at the offices of this Society.

There is one form of cruelty to dogs which, perhaps, will never be entirely suppressed until a miracle happens and human nature is changed. We refer to the continual chaining of dogs.

Dogs who suffered in the early part of the nineteenth century by being kept continually on the chain had a warm sympathiser in the Rev. Henry Crowe, Vicar of Buckingham, who, writing in 1822, said :

"I am serious in saying that I consider a dog kept on the chain for years together, and especially if alone, as one of the most pitiable objects of captivity imaginable."

"For years together!" There is no exaggeration there. The Society once took up a case on behalf of a dog who had not been off the chain more than once in nine years. In another case it was shown that the dog had been chained up for two years. Recently there was a case of a dog who had been kept in one room for seven years.

It has always been a difficult matter to obtain sufficient evidence to secure convictions in such cases,

but the Society has succeeded in doing so again and again. Sometimes a chained-up dog himself provides part of the evidence of the cruelty inflicted upon him. A dog's nails show if he has had sufficient exercise.

Within the last few years magistrates have been more willing to regard the continual chaining of dogs as "legal cruelty." A man has been punished for keeping a dog chained up for one month.

Although dogs are easily the most popular of all animals and everyone is supposed to be fond of them a great many dogs are ill-used. Every year the Society secures the conviction of some hundred and fifty persons for cruelty to dogs and cautions many others about their bad treatment of dogs.

CHAPTER VIII

LEARNING TO BE HUMANE

WHILE the Society was engaged in securing the emancipation of dogs, the need of other reforms for the benefit of animals became plainly apparent.

In 1843 the attention of the public was again drawn to the shocking cruelties to horses in the knackers' yards, horses which, of course, should have been put to death quickly and painlessly. In many cases these worn-out horses were left to stand in the knackers' stables until, famished with hunger and consumed with thirst, they dropped from sheer exhaustion and then became a prey to rats and other vermin. The living and the dead were heaped together until the living succumbed to their tortures. It was a little cheaper to leave the poor wretches to die in this fashion than to kill them.

Early in 1844 a petition from the Society complaining of the inadequacy of the laws relating to knackers' yards was presented to the House of Commons by the Hon. F. S. Wortley, and later in the year a Bill for the regulation of knackers' yards was introduced.

Mr. Cowper, who introduced the Bill, described the way in which the worn-out horses were treated in knackers' yards. In one case a policeman, hearing groans, entered a knacker's yard and found the animals gnawing each other's manes and tails for want of food. Another policeman subsequently went to the same yard and found twenty-two horses tied

up without food or water; some of them had gnawed away the wood wherever they could get it.

Stolen horses were often taken to these yards. If a policeman came to search for a stolen horse the knacker would break the animal's leg and then declare that it was brought there in that state in order to be killed.

There was no arguing against these facts, because they were based on reports furnished by the police. One member, however, tried to oppose the reform by saying that he did not believe all the police had said.

A Mr. Duncombe went a step further. He said that the Bill was admitted to proceed from the R.S.P.C.A. That alone he would consider a sufficient reason for opposing it, as no encouragement ought to be given to societies for meddling with everybody's business but their own.

And there the opposition to this humane measure ended. The Bill, which provided, among other things, that knackers' licences were to be taken out annually, that Government inspectors were to have power to enter their premises, and that there were to be penalties for obstructing constables or inspectors, became law on August 9—two months after its first reading. The working of the mind of the public is reflected in Parliament. The rapidity with which Parliament dealt with this measure for the alleviation of the sufferings of worn-out horses shows the change that had come about in the attitude of the general public towards animals.

Another proof of this welcome change in the hearts of the people at this time is forthcoming. Dog owners discovered that the penalties for dog stealing were inadequate. It may be thought that in pressing for

heavier punishment for dog thieves the owners of dogs were actuated by mercenary motives, and that they merely wanted better protection for their property, but we prefer to believe that these dog owners were not thinking only of their pockets. It must be remembered that at this time there were no dog shows and that the value of a dog was largely a "sentimental value."

The law certainly favoured the dog thief. The punishment for a first offence was a fine, but in most cases the fine was never paid, because an owner who wished to recover his stolen dog usually compromised with the thief. In two years an organized gang of thieves collected £970 for restoring stolen dogs. This state of things was largely due to the anomalies of the law. A man convicted of stealing a dog's collar worth seven shillings and sixpence was punished far more severely than he would have been if he had been convicted of stealing the dog, valued, perhaps, at £25.

A dog thief detected in his second offence ran the risk of getting twelve months' hard labour. It was the penalty for the first offence which dog owners wished to alter.

In July, 1844, a Select Committee was appointed to inquire into the subject of dog stealing, and in due course a Bill for the discomfiture of dog thieves was introduced. If this measure had become law the penalty for the second offence would have been transportation for seven years! That was, perhaps, going a little too far, and the clause was deleted before the Bill was passed. Soon afterwards a society for suppressing dog stealing was formed.

Humanitarians of the time may have noticed other

signs of the increased interest of the public in the welfare of animals. Veterinary surgeons began to use anæsthetics when operating on animals, and the general public uttered the first protests against inadequate sentences passed on offenders found guilty of cruelty. Here, for example, is an extract of a letter which appeared in *The Times* for 1848 :

“ What punishment so fit for persons convicted of cruelty to animals as flogging? Let them feel the use of the lash as the best security against the abuse of it, and empower the magistrates to inflict a penalty not exceeding £5 or a month's imprisonment with hard labour and lashes not exceeding twenty every Monday morning; and, as an inducement for bringing such offenders to justice, establish a fund in every parish for the purpose of rewarding the persons who shall procure the greatest number of convictions within the twelve-month in their respective parishes.”

This letter was followed by another in the same strain in *The Times*. The writer pointed out that a man who, for a bet, had ridden a mare from Leamington to London (nearly one hundred miles) in eleven and three-quarter hours, had only a small fine to meet. The mare died soon after she reached London.

Letters to the papers demanding heavier punishment for people who are cruel to animals are common enough to-day, but in 1848 the idea was new. May not the Society justly claim some little credit for awakening in the hearts of the people the feeling that animals are justly entitled to decent treatment? Certainly when the Society was first started no one ever suggested that people who were cruel to animals should be severely punished. In many cases the

difficulty was to induce the magistrates to inflict any punishment at all.

Evidence of the increasing interest of the public in animals and animal life generally is afforded by the events of succeeding years. An Act, which recognized the responsibility of owners of ill-treated horses and increased the penalties for cruelty, was passed in 1849. Another important measure prohibited the sale and use of poisoned grain. The practice of destroying small birds by poisoned grain had become very common, and some measure for the protection of birds was certainly overdue. In France and Germany official inquiries had already been made into the utility of small birds and the danger of destroying them.

The passing of this Bill was followed by a long discussion in *The Times* respecting the uses of small birds and their wholesale slaughter, and the friends of the birds certainly won the day.

Having protected birds from being massacred in the fields with poisoned grain, people naturally thought of the risks which animals incurred of being killed by poisoned food, and so the Poisoned Flesh Prohibition Bill was passed. This measure extended to animals the same protection from the intentional exposure in fields and other places of poisoned meat as was given to birds by the prohibition of scattering poisoned grain on the fields. The rapid passing of these measures shows plainly enough that by this time the public were on the side of the animals. People who saw cases of cruelty to animals wrote to the papers about them; they would have gained their point more quickly if they had reported the cases to the Society. (Even to-day some people forget to write to the

Society before they pour out their indignation in letters to the papers.)

Thus, in 1865, when the Thames Embankment was being made, letters appeared in *The Times* protesting against the brutal cruelty of drivers to the horses used in carting gravel. In a few days any further cruelty of the kind was prevented; the Metropolitan Board of Works gave the Society permission to send their inspectors to the works and promised to co-operate with the Society in putting an end to the cruelty. The Society prosecuted in four cases, and the magistrate at Bow Street, Sir Thomas Henry, said he considered the masters more blameable than the drivers. He then directed a police inspector to accompany one of the Society's inspectors on a visit to the contractors and to tell them that they were to employ more horses and repair the roads. If they did not attend to those demands, he would summon them as aiding and abetting and then punish them, if possible, as principal offenders.

In the same year protests were made in the papers against the cruelties inflicted on animals on board ship, and *The Times*, in a leading article on the subject, called for necessary reforms. A Select Committee was eventually appointed to inquire into the manner in which the home and foreign trade in animals by sea and railroad was conducted and to report what regulations should be enforced with a view to improving the treatment of animals in transit. The committee sat for nineteen days and heard an immense amount of evidence, after which they recommended, among other things, that the laws relating to cruelty to animals might be enforced often with advantage in the case of both vessels and railways.

In this matter *The Times* showed again by correspondence and leading articles that the people were demanding respect for the rights of animals. Soon afterwards the same paper drew the attention of the public to the practice of torturing calves by bleeding them to death in order to obtain "white veal." The practice was, of course, an infringement of the law; as to its cruelty, perhaps the following quotation from the *British Medical Journal* tells more than some readers will care to know :

"The miserable calf is bled to fainting by a stab in the jugular vein; the wound is stuffed with tow, a little gruel is administered to restore the action of the heart, and presently the wound is re-opened. If the blood does not flow readily the tail is twisted and the animal is tortured with blows and kicks. This species of torture is kept up until death is imminent. The poor animal is then tied together, neck and heels, and slung head downwards. The skin of the neck is then partially removed, and the congeries of veins cut across with a knife. An occasional blow with the pole-axe is given as it flaps to and fro in the air; and the last remnant of vitality is roused to the perception of pain by the process of dressing which consists in skinning the animal at certain parts, and then blowing in air, while the body is sedulously beaten with rods. All this refined torture is inflicted because people will have their veal bleached until it is as white and as tasteless as a kid glove. . . ."

After reading that description of the way in which calves were tortured, one man suggested in a letter to *The Times* that "the repetition some time ago in our churches of the prayer for the removal of the cattle plague, in which among other petitions the Almighty

was entreated to assuage the sufferings of the poor animals . . . seems to me to have been nothing less than an impious mockery. . . .”

The Home Secretary, questioned in the House about the method of killing calves, replied that he had directed inquiries to be made into the matter, but no case was actually brought before him. He was afraid that in many instances these cruelties had been practised. He added that the secretary of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals had advertised for information on the subject and perhaps the Society would be more fortunate than he had been.

The existence of this old, barbarous method of bleeding calves has now been stopped, but it continued for many years until the public's sensitiveness to unnecessary suffering had been sufficiently aroused. The R.S.P.C.A. successfully prosecuted butchers and farmers in different parts of the country, and, indeed, a prosecution for this horrible and totally unnecessary form of cruelty was brought as recently as 1905.

Here is one little example of the thoughtful consideration shown to animals in the streets. In 1867 the Metropolitan Drinking Fountain Association decided to make the erection and maintenance of drinking troughs for horses, dogs, sheep, and cattle a more prominent feature of their work, and the title of the Society was altered to “The Metropolitan Drinking Fountain and Cattle Trough Association.”*

* The original title of the Association, which was founded in 1859, was “The Metropolitan Free Drinking Fountain Association;” the words “and Cattle Trough” were added in 1867. The first meeting of the Executive Committee was held at the offices of the R.S.P.C.A. For the first few years the Association's operations were practically confined to providing water

In 1869 a Bill for the preservation of sea birds, by protecting them during the breeding season, was passed. It was said that sea birds were rapidly disappearing. Mr. Christopher Sykes, who brought the measure forward, said that he did so not merely on sentimental grounds but in the interests of three important classes of his constituents—the farmers, the merchant seamen, and the deep-sea fishers. Farmers from the coast to places twenty miles inland had formerly been accustomed to see flocks of sea birds following at the heels of the ploughboy and from the newly turned-up earth picking up worms and grubs. In the previous summer at a farm within a mile of the coast, not a single bird had been seen. Then again, the birds, by their cry, in former years had warned sailors of the proximity of a rocky shore; with the decrease of the birds the number of vessels which had gone ashore at Flamborough Head had steadily increased. The birds had also helped the deep-sea fishermen by hovering over the shoals of fish and thus pointing out the places where the fishermen should cast their nets.

Mr. Sykes afterwards said that he had had the support of the whole House of Commons when advocating the Bill.

The year 1869 is also of interest to all friends of the Society because it was in May of that year that the Baroness Burdett-Coutts (then Miss Burdett-

for human consumption, no special provision for horses, cattle, and dogs being made until later. The R.S.P.C.A. in its early days assisted the Association with grants of money. The Association has had to overcome many difficulties, notably that made by a statement that horses had contracted glanders by drinking at the troughs, but its utility has come to be universally recognized.

Coutts) laid the foundation stone of the present headquarters of the Society in Jermyn Street. Mr. George Wood, a patron of the Society, had given £5,000 for the purchase of the freehold site.

During this year much attention was paid to the ill-treatment of cattle and sheep on board ship and in railway trucks at home, and a departmental committee was appointed to inquire into the whole question. Beyond agitating for more humane treatment the Society could do very little for cattle ill-treated on the high seas, but it prosecuted in several cases of cruelty to animals when being conveyed by rail. In doing this the Society was not always encouraged by magistrates. For example, in one case it was shown that a man had placed sixty-five sheep in one truck and started them on their journey. Within four hours many of the sheep were found exhausted or dead at the bottom of the truck. The magistrates complimented the Society on bringing the case, but dismissed the summons, not upon a point of law, but apparently because it was incomprehensible to them that the man intended to destroy his own sheep! The magistrates overlooked the fact that the defendant had acted with a motive in putting sixty-five sheep into a truck too small for them. Regardless of the sufferings of the animals he had tried to save a little money. He paid for the use of the truck, not so much for each sheep.

In another case the Society prosecuted three drovers for cruelly beating foreign oxen which had just been landed from a steamer. It was proved that one man hit a bullock a tremendous blow on the hock and that the animal reeled and dropped on the ground as though felled by a pole-axe. The magistrate dismissed the

case on the ground that drovers had a difficult task to perform in driving bullocks of foreign breed and unacquainted with our language, and that the drovers required sticks to perform their duty. Perhaps the magistrate did not stop to ask himself what kind of stick would be needed to fell a bullock.

In a letter to *The Times* Miss Burdett-Coutts called attention to cruelty to animals, and put forward a valuable suggestion for its prevention. She asked whether systematic teaching of the absolute duty of man towards the lower animals should not enter into the practical education of all classes. An American humanitarian, Mr. Angell,* had urged her to form a society similar to one in Massachusetts under the name of the "Ladies' Humane Society." Subsequently a ladies' committee of the R.S.P.C.A. was formed with Miss Burdett-Coutts as its head, and chief among the duties of this committee was the work of introducing humane education into the schools of the country.

In the opinion of many of the Society's supporters the task the Society undertakes in teaching children and young people the duty of kindness to animals is the most important department of its work; details about it are given in a later chapter in this book.

We have now traced the growth of the Society during the first fifty years of its existence. We do not propose to chronicle the events of later times year by year, but to look at the Society as it exists to-day. It may be necessary to glance back occasionally at the reports of the past fifty years in order to show what the Society has done, is doing, and is trying to do.

* See Chapter XIV.

The Society had a difficult uphill fight during the first years of its existence, but within the last fifty years it has by good work, carried on in a sane manner, consolidated its position, and it is now recognized as one of the institutions of the country. Nowadays people of widely different views on other matters unite together in helping the R.S.P.C.A. to befriend animals, and the public generally have a greater knowledge of, and love for, animals. A clergyman once excused himself for making a short speech at one of the Society's meetings on the ground that he knew very little of the subject of kindness to animals. No one would care to make such a confession to-day! The Society now has friends and supporters in all parts of the globe, and, probably, a good many enemies. A person who has been prosecuted for cruelty to an animal does not always think kindly of the Society which enforced the law.

CHAPTER IX

ANIMALS AND THE LAW

IN passing to a brief review of the laws which have secured the betterment of the lot of animals in this country, the outstanding fact which strikes the inquirer is their modernity.

The moment we step backwards beyond the threshold of the nineteenth century we find ourselves in an age when the idea of extending the provisions of the Legislature to the protection of dumb creatures was apparently never even entertained.

Among the ancients there was only one principle which applied—that of retributive justice. The Mosaic law in Exodus xxi. 28 enjoined: “If an ox gore a man or a woman that they die, then the ox shall be surely stoned and his flesh shall not be eaten; but the owner of the ox shall be quit.” So, too, among European peoples the weapon that killed a man was itself consumed; the beast that destroyed its master paid penalty with its life.

This primitive doctrine of punishment prevailed almost to within living memory. In the Middle Ages whatever objects chanced accidentally to take human life received formal destruction. Later they became the property of the family of the deceased, later still the property of the State.

Even until as late as 1846,

Whatever moved to do the deed
Was deodand and forfeited,

and it was only when railway trains developed a habit of running into unfortunate pedestrians that the absurdity of the procedure was fully recognized.

Justice, indeed, so far as animals are concerned, seems in earlier days to have dispensed altogether with her scales, and to have worn a permanent bandage over that eye which should have been turned to the wrongs of dumb creatures.

But though the reputedly impartial goddess would recognize no rights as belonging to them, she was apparently willing to regard them as bound by duties, and allowed her courts to become the scenes of extraordinary travesties.

From the twelfth century onwards, for more than six hundred years the ecclesiastical and lay tribunals of civilized countries were freely used for the trial of animals accused of various crimes.

The ecclesiastical courts dealt chiefly with offences committed by animals in numbers, in cases where it was impossible or impracticable to secure the presence of the delinquents.

Thus, for instance, the inhabitants of a locality being annoyed by a plague of flies or by the depredations of an army of mice or rats, complaint was made to the spiritual authorities.

The court then appointed experts to inquire into the allegations and to present a careful report as to the nuisance or the extent of the damage.

Upon consideration of such report an advocate was allotted for the defence and was required to show cause why the offenders should not be summoned to answer for their misdeeds.

Accordingly, should a satisfactory excuse not be forthcoming, they were duly cited to appear, and

failing to present themselves, judgment was given against them by default.

The sentence took the form of an admonition by which the creatures concerned were solemnly warned to leave the district within a certain time. In the event of contumacy an exorcism was subsequently pronounced.

The lay courts, on the other hand, concerned themselves with individual offences, and their sentences were much more drastic.

The procedure followed in general the ordinary criminal lines. Wrongdoers were committed to prison, indictments were preferred against them, counsel were briefed to defend them, and all due formalities were observed.

In minor cases, such as straying by horses and mules, mutilation of the ears was a frequent penalty. In more serious cases, however, capital punishment was inflicted.

It is recorded that in 1494 the Mayor of a French town passed sentence in the following words upon a pig which had caused the death of a child :

“ We, in detestation and horror of this crime, and in order to make an example and satisfy justice, have declared, judged, sentenced, pronounced, and appointed that the said pig, being detained as prisoner and confined in the said abbey, shall be, by the executioners, hung and strangled upon a gibbet. In witness whereof we have sealed this present with our seal.”

There are many other instances of these trials recorded, occurring principally on the Continent. The last to take place in England was that of a dog at Chichester in 1771.

We see from the foregoing that, though the law concerned itself for centuries with the punishment of animals, it did not move so much as a finger towards their protection, at all events from a humanitarian point of view. Even in the early days of the nineteenth century, as has already been mentioned, though a man might be prosecuted for injuring his neighbour's horse or cow, the wrong done was not in respect of the animal, but of its owner, and it was necessary, in order to sustain the charge, to prove actual malice against the latter.

In 1822, as detailed in an earlier portion of this volume, Richard Martin, the Member for Galway, in the teeth of bitter opposition and widespread ridicule, secured the passage of his famous Bill, the animals' "Magna Carta."

With this measure, and with some of its principal successors upon the Statute Book, we propose to deal briefly in chronological order.

Martin's Act (1822) (3 George IV., cap. 71) was repealed by 5 and 6 William IV., cap. 59. His Act, more properly intituled "An Act to prevent the cruel and improper treatment of Cattle," was the first of its kind avowedly directed towards the prevention of cruelty.

In one respect more stringent than statutes of the present day it imposed a minimum penalty of ten shillings, the maximum being five pounds without imprisonment.

It limited its application to those who should "wantonly and cruelly beat, abuse, or ill-treat any horse, mare, gelding, mule, ass, ox, cow, heifer, steer, sheep, or other cattle."

No power of summary arrest was conferred under

it, and proceedings were required to be commenced by a complaint on oath to a magistrate. Every prosecution was to be instituted within ten days after the offence to which it related.

Many convictions were obtained under this Act, but its great practical defect was that its scope was not sufficiently extensive.

It did not include dogs, cats, or birds, and was held by the Judges not to include the bull, that being an animal of higher degree than cattle.

The next Act worthy of special notice is that of 1835: "An Act to consolidate and amend the several laws relating to the cruel and improper treatment of animals and the mischiefs arising from the driving of cattle, and to make other provisions in regard thereto." This was repealed by the Act of 1849.

This Act marks an important milestone in the history of humane progress. The credit for securing its passage was due to Mr. Pease, a member of the Society of Friends, who steered its course through Parliament, though to Mr. J. G. Meymott, honorary solicitor to the S.P.C.A., who drafted its details, and to Mr. W. A. Mackinnon, M.P., the lines of whose previous Bill it closely followed, were due no small share of its success.

Among its chief provisions were:

"That any person wantonly and cruelly beating, ill-treating, abusing, or torturing any Horse, Mare, Gelding, Bull, Ox, Cow, Heifer, Steer, Calf, Mule, Ass, Sheep, Lamb, Dog, or any other Cattle, or domestic animal, or improperly driving the same whereby any mischief shall be done, shall upon conviction be fined or imprisoned.

"That any person keeping, or using, any House,

Room, Pit, Ground, or other place, for running, baiting, or fighting any Bull, Bear, Badger, Dog, or other Animal (whether of a domestic or wild nature or kind), or for Cock-fighting, shall be liable to a penalty of £5 for every day he shall so keep and use the same.

“That persons impounding Cattle or Animals shall provide them with sufficient food, and may recover the amount from the owner—with penalty for neglect, and remedies for recovery thereof.

“That if any Cattle or Animal shall remain impounded for more than twenty-four hours without sufficient daily food, any person may enter the Pound and supply such food, etc.

“That every person keeping a Slaughter-house, etc., without previously taking out a Licence and affixing his Name over the outer gate, etc., according to the Act of 26 Geo. III., cap. 71 (before mentioned), is liable to a penalty of £5.

“That all Horses or Cattle brought to such Slaughter-house shall be killed within three days, and in the meantime be provided with good and sufficient daily food. That a correct description of every such Horse or Cattle shall be entered in a book, etc., and that such Horse, etc., shall not be employed in any work.

“That any Constable or other Peace-officer, or the Owner of any such Cattle or Animal, may seize any offender, and take him before a Justice without a Warrant.”

The Act included the provisions of Martin's Act, which it wholly repealed.

As will be noticed, it gave a power of summary arrest which was lacking in Martin's Act. It also

enacted that one half the penalties for offences against its provisions should go to the informers.

From 1835 we may pass to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act of 1849 (12 and 13 Victoria, cap. 92).

This Act was for the next sixty-two years the most important statute existing for the protection of animals. It repealed the previous Act of 1835, widened the class of existing offences, and, in general, gave much greater scope for humane activities.

Section 2 enacted "That if any Person shall from and after the passing of this Act, cruelly beat, ill-treat, over-drive, abuse, or torture, or cause or procure to be cruelly beaten, ill-treated, over-driven, abused, or tortured, any animal, every such offender shall for every such offence, forfeit and pay a penalty, not exceeding £5," to which was added the alternative of three months' imprisonment.

It will be noticed that the section refers only to acts of commission, and that mere acts of passive cruelty are not included. This was a serious defect in the statute, and was not remedied until 1911, though for some years previous to that the Judges were inclined to read into the Act omissions which led to substantial suffering.

The definition of the word "animal" as contained in the above section was held not to include birds. Accordingly, by the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1854, the word "animal" was defined as any domestic animal—whether of the kind or species particularly enumerated in Clause 29 of the Act of 1848, or of any other kind or species whatever, and whether quadruped or not.

At this stage of legislation the law afforded no

protection whatever to wild animals, but merely concerned itself with those which had been "sufficiently tame to serve some purpose for the use of man."

Many difficult battles were waged round the question of unnecessary suffering. Thus, it was held that the spaying of sows, a very painful operation in itself, was not cruelly ill-treating the animals within the section, because it was done under a *bona fide* belief that it improved the flesh for human food, and therefore served a useful purpose.

The court in this instance held that cruelty, to come within the Act, is an act of causing pain for no legally useful or justifiable purpose to the knowledge or belief of the person inflicting it (*Lewis v. Fermor*, 18 Q.B., 532).

Again, in the matter of the dishorning of cattle, the courts held divergent views. It was urged that the removal of the horns allowed beasts to be handled in transit with greater safety, and prevented dangers of injury to the beasts themselves.

From these arguments the Irish courts ultimately held, and still hold, the practice to be lawful, and the same applies to the Scottish decisions. In England, however, a different view prevails. The present view of the courts is that the operation, as ordinarily carried out by sawing off the horns at the base, is an offence under the Act—the view taken of cruelty being that the mere infliction of pain for a necessary purpose is not cruelty, but that unnecessary abuse of the animal is an offence (*Ford v. Wiley*, 23 Q.B.D., 203).

Again, the ultimate intention of the offender was held to be of no importance if there was cruelty in fact. In a notable case, a man, who wished to kill a dog, attempted to do so by various clumsy and

inadequate means before finally shooting it. He pleaded that his intention of destroying it absolved him from the consequence of his acts. The Judges, however, on appeal, decided otherwise, and held that his infliction of unnecessary suffering, as a matter of fact, quite irrespective of his object, decided the question of his guilt (*Duncan v. Pope*, 63 J.P., 217).

Again, the over-stocking of cows in markets—*i.e.*, the keeping of them in markets un milked for an undue length of time in order to enhance their selling price, was held to be cruel, although it was urged in defence that the practice was necessary and reasonable from a commercial point of view (*Waters v. Braithwaite*, 78 J.P., 124).

In another instance, the practice of branding sheep on the nose with a hot iron was upheld. In this case the divisional court, consisting of Lord Chief Justice Alverstone, Darling, J., and Bray, J., declined to interfere with the decisions of the magistrates, who had held that the said branding was reasonably necessary under the circumstances for the purpose of identification, although the operation caused substantial pain (*Bowyer v. Morgan*, 70 J.P., 253).

Passing now to the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876, which is still in force, this Act regulates the practice of vivisection. It provides, as has already been mentioned, in general that only persons holding a licence from a Secretary of State shall perform painful experiments on animals. It enacts that all animals must, during the whole of such experiments, be under the influence of an anæsthetic of sufficient power to prevent their feeling pain, and that, if the pain is likely to continue after the effect of the

anæsthetic has ceased, they must be killed before recovering sensibility.

Before the Act of 1876 was passed, the Society exerted its influence to abolish the grave abuses which then existed. Since the passing of the Act it has confined its attention to ensuring—so far as it is able under the Government system of inspection—that the provisions and safeguards of the Act are properly enforced. Owing to the experiments taking place in secret, prosecutions are extremely difficult.

We may notice in passing the various Wild Birds Protection Acts, which make it an offence for wild birds to be taken or held in possession during certain periods of the year.

The appearance of the first of these Acts in 1880 was evidence of a tardy recognition of the Legislature of the great services rendered by birds to agriculture.

For too long the parrot-like cry that birds were destructive agents was allowed to influence popular opinion against them. Farmers and agriculturists, without stopping to weigh the pros and cons, foolishly lent themselves to a war of extermination. The growing observation of naturalists, however, showed birds to be of inestimable value in ridding the countryside of insect pests, and the energetic efforts of the Society in disseminating this view, aided by the writings of distinguished men, notably the poet Longfellow, at length influenced the minds of politicians.

One of the latest of this series of Acts sounded the death-knell of that abominable engine of torture, the pole-trap, employed for the destruction of birds of prey.

Those responsible for its drafting might perhaps

have prohibited trapping on any fence or bush in addition to the words "Any pole, tree or cairn of stones or earth." The Act has, however, admirably fulfilled its objects, and thanks to several prosecutions by the Society, the use of the pole-trap has disappeared.

Until the year 1900 no protection was afforded to wild animals, whether free or in captivity. From this point of view, this year marks another important reform. Under the Act of 1849, as we have indicated, a wild animal, in no matter what circumstances, had no claim whatever to the shelter of the law. This anomaly was brought home again and again to the Society in its attempts to procure convictions for cruelty to performing animals.

The Wild Animals in Captivity Protection Act of 1900 was drafted by Mr. Greene, Q.C., M.P., supported by Sir Robert Reid, Mr. Arthur Lyttleton, Mr. Brynmor Jones, and Mr. (now Lord) Banbury, who introduced it into the House of Commons. It was repealed by the Protection of Animals Act, 1911, which incorporated it in substance.

By means of this short and practical measure the scope of the Society's work was greatly increased, and a wide loophole which had allowed the escape of numerous offenders for acts of cruelty, sometimes of the grossest nature, was effectually sealed.

Section 2 of the Act made it an offence to cause or permit unnecessary suffering to any wild animal when maimed, pinioned, or in captivity. Further, it made it an offence to cruelly abuse, infuriate, tease, or terrify such animal, or permit the same to be so treated.

It may be mentioned that in this Act the word

“tease” and “terrify” occur for the first time as offences, thus indicating an extension of the law from physical to mental suffering. The Society was not slow in availing itself of this Act, and numerous prosecutions were brought against persons who ill-treated performing animals, with the result that a type of abuse which had formerly been quite outside the Society’s power to subdue was brought into line with ordinary offences of cruelty.

A notable case under this Act was the prosecution of an elephant trainer and his assistants for abusing and terrifying an elephant. The alleged cruelty consisted of forcing an elephant down a steep chute into a tank of water.

Evidence showed that the elephant during the rehearsal of the performance was forced to descend a chute, notwithstanding its cries of pain and terror. The movements of the beast showed that it was suffering the greatest alarm at the prospect of going down the chute, and the Society contended that quite apart from any physical pain which might have been inflicted on the elephant, the defendants had brought themselves within the Act by cruelly terrifying the animal into a performance which was naturally most alarming to it.

The magistrate bound over the trainer, and imposed penalties of £5 and £2 respectively on the assistants, observing that it was much to be regretted that the public itself should encourage these exhibitions, which in the nature of things must involve some element of suffering. The question was whether this elephant was cruelly treated or terrified. No one who heard the evidence and considered the matter could doubt that the elephant must have been naturally terrified

at the prospect before it when it reached the top of the chute, and the prodding with the stick and dragging with ropes added pain to the terror.

In spite of the above decision the performance was continued, with the result that the Society again instituted proceedings. In this case the magistrate imposed on the trainer a fine of £5 and £30 costs.

For a great many years the Society has been greatly exercised by the frequent abuses of horses employed in coal mines (referred to in another chapter).

Immured in underground workings hundreds of feet from the light of day, without any adequate system of inspection, these animals may be particularly subject to cruelty at the caprice of brutal or callous persons.

The means of detecting offences were—and still are—extremely difficult, for any attempt to obtain access to the mines was met by the objection that such were private property.

The Society by every means in its power endeavoured to induce the mining authorities to take adequate steps for protection of their dumb workers. It pointed out that from a mass of cumulative evidence no doubt could exist that horses were frequently ill-treated in the most brutal manner by the pit-lads into whose charge they were given. It cited instances of insanitary stables; proved beyond question that horses were kept for undue periods of time below ground without returning to the surface; established the fact that blind ponies were employed in many mines, and that in numerous cases unfortunate animals, in order to secure a larger output, were forced to work in double shifts.

In short, so serious an indictment did the Society

and others bring against those responsible for the welfare of the 100,000 or more animals working below ground that public indignation was at length aroused, and in 1911 the Coal Mines Act (1 and 2 George V., cap. 50) was passed.

The third schedule of the Act provides among other things as follows :

No horse shall be taken underground until it is four years old.

All horses underground shall be housed in properly constructed stables, which shall be lime-washed at least once in three months and shall be continuously ventilated.

Horse-keepers shall be appointed in the proportion of at least one horse-keeper to every fifteen horses.

A sufficient supply of food and water and medicines shall be provided.

Horses shall not be allowed to go out to work unfit or improperly shod, or with ill-fitting harness.

No blind horse shall be worked in a mine.

Cases of sickness, injury, or ill-treatment shall be reported to the manager or under-manager.

A daily record shall be kept of the times at which horses are worked.

An annual return shall be made to the Government inspector showing the number of deaths and cases of injury or ill-treatment.

Section 109 provides for the appointment of special Government inspectors for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of the Act relating to animals.

It will be seen from the foregoing that the safeguards, at all events as laid down on paper, are fairly comprehensive. In practice, however, so long as

animals are employed underground there are still improvements to be desired. Recent reports of the Home Office show that the conditions as to stabling have not always been observed, while the system of inspection is quite inadequate.

There are, at present, some 63,000 horses, asses, and mules employed in and about 1,699 mines, yet to deal with this vast number of animals there are but eight inspectors.

By far the most important statute which we have to notice in these pages is the Protection of Animals Act, 1911, which repealed the Act of 1848.

To Sir George Greenwood (M.P. for Peterborough, 1906-1918) and the Hon. and Reverend F. E. Bowen is due the chief credit for drafting the provisions of this Act, and to the former ardent humanitarian was entrusted the task of piloting it safely through Parliament.

Under this Act, which consolidated all the previous Acts, the great bulk of the Society's prosecutions are now brought.

Section 1 of this Act prohibits the offences contained in the 1849 Act, and includes the infuriating or terrifying, which were a feature of the Wild Animals in Captivity Protection Act.

The causing of an offence is also penalized, and owners are rendered specially liable for permitting cruelty, a responsibility being cast upon them to take reasonable care and supervision, which renders the plea of lack of knowledge of an animal's actual condition unavailable.

By a general provision that if a person shall "by wantonly or unreasonably doing any act, or causing or procuring the commission or omission of any act,

cause any unnecessary suffering," a very wide discretion is left to magistrates. Indeed, it may be said that the whole effect of the statute depends very largely on the word "unreasonably," and in nine cases out of ten the guilt of an offender is decided by the view which the court takes of his conduct when compared with that of an average citizen.

As previously mentioned, the Act of 1849 did not specifically regard acts of omission as offences, and for this reason many cases of gross neglect escaped well-merited punishment. In the present Act, however, this defect has been repaired and omissions rank on an equal footing with acts of commission.

In addition to specific offences of beating, kicking, ill-treating, over-riding, over-driving, over-loading, torturing, infuriating, or terrifying, the improperly conveying of an animal is punishable. So, too, are the offences of administering poison without reasonable cause or excuse, causing animals to fight, and using dogs for draught on the highway.

It is also an offence to perform an operation on an animal without due care and humanity.

A further provision, not included in previous Acts, is that persons setting spring traps for the purpose of catching hares and rabbits are required under a penalty of £5 to inspect the traps at least once a day between sunrise and sunset.

Another provision, included for the first time, is that upon conviction of an owner the court may order an animal to be destroyed if, in the opinion of a veterinary surgeon, it is cruel to keep it alive. The court also has power upon conviction to deprive the owner of his possession of an animal, if it is likely to be exposed to further cruelty in his charge.

As originally passed, the maximum in penalties provided were a fine of £25, together with six months' imprisonment with hard labour. The period of imprisonment, however, was reduced to three months' hard labour by the Protection of Animals Act (1911) Amendment Act (1912).

The Act does not interfere with the provisions of the Act of 1876, mentioned above, regulating vivisection, and while it protects animals in captivity, it does not apply to acts or omissions arising in the destruction of animals for human food where no unnecessary suffering is entailed, nor to the coursing or hunting of any captive animal unless the same is liberated in an injured, mutilated, or exhausted condition.

It has been the constant aim of the Society to secure as wide an interpretation of the statute as possible, in order to protect animals from undoubted misery where the evidences of actual physical suffering are difficult to establish.

Two instances will illustrate our point. Who, for example, can doubt that a wild bird taken from its natural freedom and condemned to a life of imprisonment in a small cage a few inches square does not deserve the fullest protection which the law can afford?

In such a case, however, the condition of the bird may not show actual injury, and it becomes a question of argument as to what degree of suffering may be inferred from which to justify a conviction.

By insisting upon a recognition of the mental aspect of cruelty, as well as the physical, the Society has done a very great deal for wild birds during the past two years. Magistrates, especially the London

stipendiaries, have shown a sympathetic inclination towards the Society's arguments, in consequence of which a large number of convictions have been obtained.

The second example concerns the keeping of dogs on chains for an undue length of time.

Here again, though the evidences of physical suffering are often slight, magistrates in largely increasing numbers are taking into account the distress which dogs must inevitably suffer from such irksome and unnatural confinement, and are convicting in cases which a few years ago would have had little chance of success.

In passing from the Act of 1911 to the present day, we may briefly note that several minor measures, in several ways extending its scope, have been subsequently passed.

The Ministry of Agriculture has issued various important orders regulating the transit of animals both by land and sea, many of which have for their object the prevention of cruelty. The Poultry Act of 1911 enables the Ministry of Agriculture to make orders for protecting poultry in transit, of which the Society has availed itself in considerable measure.

The Exportation of Horses Act, 1914, which is referred to at greater length elsewhere, prohibits in general the exportation of any horse from any port in Great Britain to any port outside the British Isles, unless such horse has been certified by a veterinary surgeon to be capable of being worked without suffering. This frustrates the schemes of unscrupulous dealers, who very frequently shipped totally unfit horses, exported ostensibly for knacker purposes, but with the real object of allowing them

to be worked to death under the most distressing conditions on foreign soil.

The Animals Anæsthetic Act, 1919, provides for the obligatory administration of anæsthetics to animals when subjected to painful operations.

The Captive Birds Shooting (Prohibition) Act, 1921, put a stop to the so-called sport of shooting pigeons and other birds liberated from traps.

The Importation of Plumage (Prohibition) Act, 1921, already referred to, also crowned with partial success, after ten abortive attempts spread over a period of many years, the efforts of the R.S.P.C.A. and kindred societies to abolish the cruelties involved in the slaughter of birds for fashionable purposes.

The above comprises as much as it seems desirable to state in a work of this description of the legal aspect of the subject. It may be pointed out, however, in fairness to all who play a part in the punitive activities of the R.S.P.C.A., that the conviction of offenders for cruelty is beset with certain difficulties which are not apparent in the ordinary run of criminal proceedings.

In almost every other department of the criminal law, the guilt or innocence of an offender is decided in the main by pure questions of fact. Questions of opinion may and do arise in the course of cases, but they are as a rule subsidiary to circumstances which are capable of definite proof by firsthand observation.

In the Society's cases, however, the balance of evidence, sooner or later, turns almost entirely upon a question of expert opinion. The outstanding facts—*i.e.*, whether a horse is or is not lame, or whether a dog is or is not chained—are not generally in dispute. What is in dispute, however, is the degree of suffering

arising as a consequence of certain acts or omissions, and here the evidence of veterinary surgeons is the guide on which the court chiefly relies; evidence which, while given without any suggestion of improper motive, may, nevertheless, be as widely divergent as the poles. It is perhaps a consequence of this characteristic that persons accused of cruelty very rarely enter a plea of guilty.

Another difficulty is the still widespread belief that animals are not keenly sensitive to pain; a belief which is frequently seen reflected from benches by the imposition of inadequate penalties.

Though such a fallacy seems difficult of credence in view of the progress of modern science, it is not perhaps altogether surprising when we consider that the Society is now celebrating only the first centenary of its work.

To those who clamour for the immediate suppression of cruelty in all its aspects, therefore, we offer the true, if trite, reflection that though a hundred years measured in terms of human life is a considerable span, yet in the formation of national character it is, as history teaches, comparatively a negligible period.

CHAPTER X

THE CHILDREN'S BRANCHES OF THE SOCIETY

THE most lasting work which can be done by any society founded to reform humanity in any one direction must be done by a systematic education of the young, because, if opportunity is given them at an early age to form any definite habits, those habits will not only remain with them during life, but will become part and parcel of the everyday life of a nation. The truth of this is readily seen in connection with the propaganda and educational work of the R.S.P.C.A., for it is becoming more and more the habit of the nation to be regardful of its animals and their welfare. If this can be the result of one hundred years of voluntary work, how much more rapidly will the reform spread if it is adopted by the educational authorities and grafted into the regular school curriculum. As each successive generation of teachers takes up the work of educating the young to noble thoughts and actions in regard to the claims of animals for justice, the need for their protection by police and inspectors will decrease, until it becomes unnecessary for such preventive work to be carried on. This prophecy may seem Utopian, but surely with the results of one hundred years' work for the animals as a guide, it may be fulfilled.

The importance of humane education has been realized in America; twenty-eight of the States have passed laws providing for the regular teaching of

kindness to animals. The work is growing apace, and is encouraged by the Government authorities in those States because experience has already shown that the child, who at the early age is taught to respect the rights of the animals around him, will grow up a far better citizen with self-control and a right feeling for his fellow-man. John Bright—that great thinker and believer in personal individuality—rightly said, “If children at school can be made to understand how it is just and noble to be humane even to what we term inferior animals, it will do much to give them higher tone and character throughout.” The same thought ran through the mind of Ruskin, that enthusiastic lover of Nature who founded the Society of St. George to protect animals, when he wrote: “It is character building which is our great business in the world. No small part is done by our treatment of the animals committed to our care. Without perfect sympathy with the animals around them no gentleman’s education, no Christian education, could be of any possible use.”

This fact was realized so long ago as 1775, for Dr. Primatt, in his book on “The Duty of Mercy and the Sin of Cruelty to Brute Beasts,” already referred to in a previous chapter, pleaded for humane education in the following words:

“The minds of children are naturally both tender and susceptible of soft impressions and are open to instructions by which parents may lay a sure foundation for reverential love for themselves, but if they suffer the child to commit acts of cruelty they harden him.”

This educational work, as one would expect when one recollects that the founder of the Society—the

Rev. Arthur Broome—edited Dr. Primatt's book, was, therefore, "one of the principal means proposed to be employed by the Society." But it must be remembered that education as a whole was, in those early days, much neglected, and at the most was confined to the "teaching of the three Rs"; therefore the importance of educating the young in the duty of being kind to animals was almost wholly neglected, and hence the crying need for laws and for agents to enforce them and so create a higher public standard of the treatment of animals. So long, for instance, as bull-baiting, dog-fighting, cock-fighting, cock-throwing, and other barbarous pastimes were not forbidden by law, it was almost useless to try to persuade children that such amusements were morally wrong.

Teachers in Sunday-schools must have had some difficult tasks before there was any law in this country for the protection of animals. Imagine, for example, what kind of lesson a teacher could have given on the text, "A righteous man regardeth the life of his beast" to a class of boys eagerly looking forward to a bull-baiting in the village on the following day. Perhaps the majority of teachers avoided the subject, but we have come across a reference to one—we greatly regret that we cannot give his name—who, in 1796, was bold enough to include humanity to animals in the subjects he taught in his school. In the course of an article on the rights of animals published in the *European Magazine* of that year, the writer refers to a "respectable gentleman of Bath" who was in the habit of giving short addresses to Sunday-school children on kindness to animals. This is the earliest reference we can discover to the teaching of this subject in a school.

When the Society started, it could not undertake the work of educating children; the task of trying to convert their elders was more than sufficient for those who were responsible for keeping the Society alive. For some years, all that the Society could do in the way of teaching children was to put tracts and pamphlets in their hands.

In 1837, when the patronage of Queen Victoria had given a great impetus to the work of the Society, the committee turned their attention to humane education, and in the report of that year we find the first reference to illustrated lectures for children. A lecturer asked for a guarantee of £20, "should it be needed, to furnish glasses to show the animal functions, and by this means teach the young mind to avoid cruelty." The money was provided. A special school committee was formed; the members of the committee visited schools and encouraged the children to write essays on kindness to animals. Large quantities of tracts and pamphlets were circulated; some even found their way to gaols. That children badly needed instruction is shown by a reference in an early report to "a not uncommon amusement, spinning cockchafers on a needle." We do not know exactly how this amusement was conducted or what particular pleasure children derived from it, but we are confident that comparatively few children of to-day would be guilty of "spinning cockchafers on a needle."

From year to year the Society never lost sight of the importance of humane education. In the reports of speeches delivered at the Society's meetings in the forties, we come across such sentences as: "Its connection with education gives the Society its greatest value. . . ." "The root of the whole matter is educa-

tion. . . ." "Education is, after all, the mighty engine by which alone we can hope to work successfully," and so on. Some ladies organized classes for children in London, Nottingham, and other places, and the Society offered substantial money prizes one year for papers, written by adults, on the Society's objects. At one time, private individuals gave prizes for the best essays on kindness to animals written by boys of Merchant Taylors' School, Christ's Hospital, and Charterhouse, and this custom could well be revived at the present time, for education is as necessary in those schools as in other schools. Any good results produced by those competitions were limited to the schools in which they were held; what was needed was a much larger scheme, one which would attract the interest of hundreds of thousands of children all over the country.

A speaker at the Society's annual meeting of 1852 hit upon the right idea. He thought that prizes should be provided for classes "from which are taken those who are to have the management and treatment of animals committed to them in after life."

Working on that suggestion, the Society obtained the assistance of Government inspectors of schools, and in 1858 two school inspectors were appointed honorary members of the Society's committee.

From that time onward the Society increased its work among children. Nature books suitable for children were provided; lantern lectures on the aims of the Society were delivered to children all over the country. But there was still something lacking—the creation of a branch of the Society to which children could belong.

That branch, now known all over the world as the

"Band of Mercy," was formed gradually; it began in a very modest way with a class for children held in a private house. But even before that one class was established, certain events occurred which undoubtedly influenced those who felt the need of humane education for children.

In 1869, Mr. Angell,* the founder and president of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, while upon a visit to this country, called upon the Baroness Burdett-Coutts (then Miss Burdett-Coutts) and urged her to form a society, to be known as the Ladies' Humane Society, with the object of introducing the systematic teaching of the duty of man towards the lower animals into all schools. Miss Burdett-Coutts brought the matter to the notice of the public by means of a letter in *The Times*, which was followed up by another letter from Mr. John Colam, then secretary of the Society.

The Society called a meeting of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses for the purpose of discussing the best means of acting upon Mr. Angell's suggestion, and decided to circularize 150 of the schools of London, and to hold essay competitions in the schools; the subject of the essays to be the duty of kindness to animals. The first competitions were restricted to London schools.

Mr. Angell's suggestion of a separate society, to be known as the Ladies' Humane Society, having as its chief object the teaching of children, was not acted upon; instead, a Ladies' Committee of the parent Society was formed, and the first meeting was held in August, 1870, at the house of Miss Burdett-Coutts at Highgate.

* See Chapter XIV.

While the Society was thus pressing forward its work among children, one of its members suggested the establishment of still another branch of the Society. The Society protected animals from cruelty, but many children were in equal need of protection from ill-treatment. Why should not the Society form a branch for the protection of children?

This suggestion was made in a letter to the *Animal World*, the official magazine of the Society, and the author signed his letter "An Old Bachelor." This humane man—we have been unable to discover his name—was in advance of his time. A branch of the Society for the protection of children was not then formed, but in 1884 a separate society for this object, the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, was founded. Mr. Colam, as secretary of the R.S.P.C.A., took a great interest in this Society and assisted in its formation. Lord Shaftesbury and the Baroness Burdett-Coutts were also greatly interested in the "baby" of the R.S.P.C.A., as it was then called. A similar society had already been established in Liverpool. Speaking at the annual meeting of the R.S.P.C.A. in 1885, the Rev. Benjamin Waugh, referring to the children's Society, said that it owed its present position greatly to the help afforded by the R.S.P.C.A., and especially to Mr. Colam, for the wonderful energy he had thrown into the work. Mr. Colam was a member of the committee of the N.S.P.C.C.

One of the excuses occasionally put forward for not supporting the R.S.P.C.A. is: "I prefer to do what little good I can for the benefit of children; human beings come first." We do not dispute the fact that the life of a human being is more sacred than the life

of an animal, but we fail to see that that fact should be used as an excuse for not befriending animals. Children and animals are alike defenceless against the misdeeds of men and women.

We return to the Society and its efforts to interest children in its work. The early essay competitions in London schools were very successful, but the much-needed branch of the Society for children had not yet been formed, and, in one sense, the Society never formed it. To Mrs. Suckling, of Romsey, whose death last year was a great loss to the Society, and, indeed, to all lovers of animals, is due the honour of forming the first Band of Mercy. In 1874, Mrs. Suckling held classes for children at her house. The children were encouraged to take an interest in animals, and to be kind to them, and from those classes sprang the present organization, having a membership of many thousands of children.

We know, however, that if Mrs. Suckling were alive, she would disclaim the honour of being the founder of the Band of Mercy. Eager, as she always was, to efface herself and to give the credit of her good deeds to others, Mrs. Suckling used to say that she had "learned it all" from Miss Maria Michell, a lady who greatly aided the Society soon after its foundation. Within a short time of her death, Mrs. Suckling took pains to impress upon us the importance of giving to Miss Maria Michell the honour of sowing the seed from which sprang the children's branches of the Society.

Mrs. Suckling's class for children was known as the "Humanity Class." The title "Band of Mercy" was first used by Mrs. Smithies, who, in 1876, organized a society of youths and children. She was assisted by

her son and other friends of animals. This society was known as the "Wood Green Band of Mercy for Promoting Kindness to Animals."

Mrs. Smithies was a member of the Ladies' Committee of the Society, but at that time her Band of Mercy was a separate organization. Thanks to Mrs. Smithies' good example, other ladies formed "Bands of Mercy" in different parts of the country and independently of the Society. Mrs. Smithies died in 1878, but her good work was carried on by her son and daughter, and in 1879 they brought out a little magazine for children called the *Band of Mercy Advocate*. When, in 1883, Mr. Smithies was compelled by ill-health to give up the work, he very generously passed over to the Society the copyright of his magazine, now known as the *Band of Mercy*, and all the Bands of Mercy then in existence were joined up to the parent Society.

In 1882, the first Band of Mercy was formed in America by Mr. Angell. In the course of an address at one of the early meetings, he said it was his privilege to know Catherine Smithies, of London, the founder of the Band of Mercy. He said: "She was a woman of intense religious devotion—a believer in prayer. She saw that the teaching of children to be kind to the lower creatures was not only effective in preventing cruelty to them, but also in preventing cruelty and crime towards each other and the community. In one of her last letters, before she passed from earth, she said to us, 'I think the teaching of children to be kind and merciful to God's lower creatures is preparing the way for the Gospel of Christ.'"

A Band of Mercy conference was held at the

Society's offices on January 31, 1883, at which the Baroness Burdett-Coutts presided, and delegates from a number of Bands were present. The delegate from the Romsey Branch was the Rev. T. F. Moor, who said that Romsey (Mrs. Suckling's home) had a very large Band, extending over a large tract of country. It had 17 different organizations, numbering about 250 members. The Band originated from Mrs. Suckling.

At this conference the following resolutions were passed :

“ 1. At this first conference of Bands of Mercy, now assembled by invitation issued by the Ladies' Committee of the R.S.P.C.A., it is resolved that a union be hereby formed of all Bands of Mercy throughout the United Kingdom, and that the R.S.P.C.A. be placed at the head of such union, for the purpose of giving counsel and assistance to the Bands, subject to the following provisions—viz. :

“(a) That the R.S.P.C.A. be regarded as the governing body of the union, but responsible only in matters of general character.

“(b) That the Bands retain their individual freedom of direction and responsibility in all matters relating to local proceedings.

“(c) That the governing body, and the Bands respectively, disburse their own expenses, the governing body demanding no contribution from the Bands, and the Bands receiving no grants of money from the governing body.

“ 2. That in the opinion of this conference it is desirable that uniform cards of membership,

medals, members' rolls, and members' registers, be adopted by the Bands throughout the United Kingdom, the governing body providing and supplying the same at cost price.

"3. That the monthly journal now issued by the R.S.P.C.A., entitled *Band of Mercy*, continue to be regarded as the organ of the union, and that this conference pledges itself, and recommends all Bands throughout the United Kingdom, as far as practicable, to extend its circulation generally, and particularly among the members of Bands."

At the close, the Baroness Burdett-Coutts said she hoped the conference would be the beginning of an era in the new movement.

Soon afterwards, Band of Mercy medals were issued by the Society, the design being similar to that which had been issued for the Queen's Medal of the Society. Queen Victoria, noticing that there was not a cat in the original design for the medal, commanded that the cat should not be overlooked, and sketched one into the design herself.

Since the day when the first Bands of Mercy were affiliated to the Society, the educational work has been carried on, systematically and voluntarily, with ever-increasing success. And yet it has been the painful duty of the R.S.P.C.A. to admonish and even to prosecute children for horrible and wilful cruelty to animals, which would have been impossible had those same children come under the influence of a systematic education which includes lessons in kindness to animals. It is not our purpose here to do more than indicate the necessity and importance of such a work,

but the following few examples of prosecution must surely convince the reader that the present system of education which, officially, ignores altogether this important subject, or leaves it to voluntary efforts of teachers and outside organizations, is wrong :

Some short time ago, at St. Columb Petty Sessions, a girl of fourteen was summoned for cruelly ill-treating three young thrushes. The statements of several of her young companions showed that she took the birds from the nest and killed them by means of a pin.

A lad of fourteen was summoned for cruelty to a cat by pouring paraffin oil over it and burning it alive.

A boy, nine years old, was charged with cruelly ill-treating a pig, at Fishponds, and thereby causing its death.

Two lads were charged at Gateshead with cruelty to a hedgehog. It was stated that the lads found the hedgehog and took it into a cabin. One placed it on a hot stove and the other poured oil over it. It was then thrown on the fire and was roasted to death. The lads were each fined £1 with costs.

At Melton Mowbray Petty Sessions, three lads were charged with cruelly ill-treating a kitten. The defendants threw the kitten about as though it were a ball, inflicting shocking injuries. Fines, each defendant, £1 is.

At Wrexham, two boys were summoned for cruelty to a cow by cutting its tail off. Fined £1 and costs each.

At York, five boys were summoned for cruelty to a pony. They chased the animal with sticks round a field until it fell into a ditch and broke its back. Fined £1 each.

At Lynn, a boy, aged eleven years, apparently from

pure wantonness, cruelly mutilated four fowls, and left them to die in a ditch.

At the present time the possibility of children growing up capable of such brutalities is fought against only by voluntary workers. The fact that there are many hundreds of Bands of Mercy, and many school teachers who, of their own accord, seek to influence the children in these things, encourages one to hope that there may be a Government far-sighted enough to realize the importance of this work among the young, and willing to make proper provision for a definite system of instruction. We know that the excuse is often made that the school curriculum is already overcrowded and cannot be added to. We admit this, and would go further and say that many subjects now taught are entirely useless to the average child—but, on the other hand, the subject of kindness can be introduced in dictation, reading, composition, and recitation lessons, as is already found in many schools when the Society has been allowed entrance. The essay competitions, already referred to, have received the cordial support of many headmasters and mistresses all over the country, and in London alone 245,000 children entered for the Society's competition in 1923. Many of the Society's branches have successfully taken up this special work, and the Society's publications have been officially recognized by directors of education in several areas.

The Society sends, free of charge, lecturers who illustrate their addresses with lantern slides and cinema films if arrangements permit, and the Society's *Band of Mercy* monthly magazine serves to maintain the interest in the animal cause aroused by such educational means.

Further, in order that Bands working in districts remote from London may be kept in touch with headquarters, the Society employs a Humane Education Organizer, who goes about the country offering advice and assistance wherever they may be required, and helping generally to make the children's branches realize the importance of the assistance they give to the Society.

Within the last year, the Council of the Society has established the Animal Defenders Corps for the benefit of young people who are too old to belong to Bands of Mercy but who are not old enough to be active workers for the Society itself. The value of this connecting link between the children's branches and the Society has already been proved, and its success is assured.

CHAPTER XI

THE HUMANE SLAUGHTER OF ANIMALS

IN 1773 Benjamin Franklin suggested that animals required for food might be humanely killed by means of electricity, but, as we will presently show, there was more than one great drawback to that method.

Writing in 1796 on the moral duties of man towards the brute creation, John Lawrence, who afterwards became one of the first members of the Society, penned these words :

“Many acts of cruelty to poor animals, destined for the slaughter, are overlooked, and which it is damnable infamy to tolerate.”

John Lawrence knew something of the use of the pole-axe as an instrument for killing animals. In his book he stated that in some cases a dozen blows had been necessary to bring down a bullock, and with the object of preventing such cruelty he suggested putting “blinds” on an animal when it was about to be killed.

The suffering of animals in slaughter-houses must have been in the minds of those humanitarians who assembled on June 16, 1824, to form the Society. The Society had not been in existence many days before it began its work of securing better treatment for animals about to be slaughtered. A committee, of which Richard Martin was a member, was appointed to inspect the slaughter-houses of the Metropolis. The members of this committee were assisted in their work by the Society’s one inspector.

Two months after the Society was formed this inspector asked the Society to advance a small sum of money "for the purpose of putting a stop to the evil in throwing sheep down into the slaughter-houses from a considerable height." The minutes do not explain how the money was to be spent, but the committee advanced it, and evidently it was well used, for gradually the practice of throwing sheep into the underground slaughter-houses was stopped.

At a later meeting the committee arranged for an exhibition of slaughtering instruments then in use. A picture showing the method of slaughtering calves was exhibited, and a paper about the then common practice of skinning animals alive was read. A letter was read from a butcher who stated that he had seen three legs of a sheep flayed before the animal was dead, "and not infrequently heard an oath from the mouth of the operator at every movement of the animal because that movement interfered with the next cut of the knife. This cruelty I believe to be very common."

The Society received other evidence of the existence of this practice. One man stated that from his own observation he believed that more than half of the sheep slaughtered in London were skinned whilst they possessed "a considerable degree of vitality." He had seen the process carried on at Newport Market, and on speaking to the butcher was told it was the usual custom. This speaker had found an effective way of preventing a little of this cruelty; he sent this message to his butcher: "I will not deal with you unless you permit me to see the manner in which you kill your meat." This example might be followed with useful results even to-day. It is the

privacy of the slaughter-house which tends to encourage unnecessary suffering.

But the practice of skinning animals before they were dead and the barbarous methods of killing them were not the only forms of cruelty observed in and around slaughter-houses. The animals were naturally reluctant to enter the slaughter-houses, reeking of blood and filth, and the drovers were callously indifferent to the suffering they caused to the animals when driving them to slaughter.

A humane butcher—Mr. Richard Smith, of Aldgate—discovered a way of preventing some of this cruelty. He trained a lamb to lead the sheep into the slaughter-house. The sheep followed the lamb quietly, and in this way much cruelty was prevented. This is a custom which is often resorted to, and in one of the largest slaughter-houses in Toronto they have such a "Judas," who for many years has passively conducted his fellow bullocks to the slaughter-pen. The Society showed their appreciation of Mr. Smith's humanity by presenting him with a silver cup, and acting on the suggestion they had received from him they succeeded in preventing cruelty to oxen driven into Whitechapel and Aldgate. "One or two tractable horses" (says the record) "were employed to walk before the oxen into the narrow passages leading into the slaughter-houses." The oxen followed the horses without giving much trouble, and so much cruelty was avoided. The committee also devised a plan for preventing cruelty to sheep driven in London streets. A net was passed over the flock, so that carriages were prevented from running over the sheep or scattering them.

In 1829 a member of the Society's committee

showed that he was well in advance of his time, for he suggested what was then a novel method for the humane slaughter of animals required for food. This man described—we quote from the Society's first minute book—"a beneficial mode of slaughtering bullocks by a pistol shot closely applied to the head."

Apparently the Society's committee did not deem it wise to act upon that suggestion, for there is no record of any experiments having been made. It is interesting to note, however, that fifty years afterwards, and long before the R.S.P.C.A. humane killer was invented, the Society discovered that a White-chapel butcher had been in the habit of killing his beasts by shooting them. He turned the animal loose into the slaughter-house and fired when he was two feet away from it; in place of a leaden bullet he used a small marble. One can only hope that he was an expert shot and brought down his animal with the first shot.

Since then many experiments have been made and the value of the method first suggested in 1829 has been proved beyond all question. The R.S.P.C.A. humane killer of to-day, which is really a pistol fixed on a long shaft, with the trigger in the end of the handle, is based on that idea.

Although the need of some instrument which would kill an animal painlessly must have been obvious to everyone who gave a thought to the cruelties of the slaughter-house the Society were unable at this time to offer any efficient substitute for the pole-axe. To prevent cruelty to animals when they were being driven or brought to slaughter was not a simple matter, either, for "the custom of the trade" was accepted by some magistrates as an excuse for

brutality. Thus, in a case which the Society brought against a calf dealer for carrying calves a long distance with their heads hanging out of the cart, the magistrate admitted the practice was cruel, but added that as it was proved to be of established usage and was said by the calf dealers to be the best known to them, it was impossible for him to decide it was wanton cruelty within the meaning of the Act.

The committee of the Society decided at this time that it was useless to prosecute for wanton cruelty in Smithfield Market, since it was impossible to prove to the satisfaction of the magistrates that the acts were wanton. But if prosecutions were useless there were other ways of persuading the drovers to be humane. Speaking at the Society's annual meeting in 1836, Sir George Chetwynd suggested that heads of families should instruct their servants not to accept any joint from a butcher which had the appearance of a wound or bruise on it. The butchers would then entreat the drovers to abstain from ill-treating the animals.

Subsequently the Society took a prominent part in the long drawn-out proceedings which ended in the removal of that great home of cruelty to animals—Smithfield Market. One does not care to think how the animals brought to Smithfield fared before Martin's Act protected them. It was stated that that Act suppressed nine-tenths of the cruelties formerly practised in the market; yet the remaining tenth made the place a disgrace to London. One fourth of all the cattle brought to Smithfield were killed in or near the market, and the slaughtering, which was entrusted to the scum of the people, was performed in obscure dens.

Having disposed of Smithfield, the Society en-

deavoured to find a humane method of killing animals. Acting for the Society, Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson* made some experiments with electricity, but found that if the shock killed the animal it would not bleed properly, while if the shock was not completely effective the animal showed signs of returning consciousness while it was being bled. But there were other drawbacks to the use of electricity. The process was dangerous and it blackened the flesh. Sir Benjamin also tried experiments with "narcotic vapours," but without success.

In trying to secure the invention of an instrument for killing animals humanely the Society carefully examined the various methods employed in the slaughter-houses.

The most common instrument in London was, of course, the pole-axe, but there was more than one kind of pole-axe. A method named after its originator, a Mr. Wackett, needed the employment of two men. One man held a short bolt on the head of the beast, and the slaughterman, using a mallet, drove the bolt home into the skull. It was said that in this way the slaughterman secured precision of aim. Bruneau, a Frenchman, improved on this method. He strapped a mask over the animal's face, eyes, and head, before the bolt was driven into the animal's head with a mallet. This method is still employed in some Continental slaughter-houses, and has, of course, advantages over the pole-axe, as still used in the majority of our own slaughter-houses.

Baxter, an Englishman, improved on Bruneau's method by doing away with the straps on the mask

* The inventor of the lethal chambers as used at the Battersea Home for Lost Dogs.

and using springs for holding it in position on the animal's face.

In one method of killing dynamite was used. When this method worked properly it was effective in destroying the brain and thus rendering the animal unconscious, but the method was highly dangerous; besides, if the charge was not placed exactly in the right position the animal was not killed.

In some places a guillotine was used for killing an animal, but this method was found to be impracticable and cruel. Sometimes an animal was shot with an ordinary gun, but even when the animal was masked this plan was objectionable on the ground of danger. The Spanish method of killing was by the use of a large dagger.

Calves were killed by being stunned with an iron mallet. The head was then nearly severed from the body. Pigs were stuck in the throat, and sheep were generally placed on their sides and stuck in the neck. This method is still, unfortunately, in use in the greater number of our slaughter-houses, and the animal is cut while in full consciousness. Siegmund, a veterinary surgeon of Basle, invented an appliance by which the animal was shot after a mask had been placed over its face. The inventor of this instrument was the director of the abattoir at Basle from 1870 for about thirty years, and was also president of the Basle S.P.C.A. This instrument fired a bullet through the brain, after which the bullet passed through the spinal canal. But Siegmund had not got the idea of holding an instrument over the brain; he fixed a barrel in a mask, which was then attached to the head of the animal. His invention was used at the Basle abattoir about 1873, and, with improved

designs, it has been used there ever since. Siegmund may be said to have been the "father" of the humane killer.

While the Society was occupied with this task of finding a humane method of killing animals it was also engaged in trying to bring about a much needed reform—the abolition of private slaughter-houses. In 1873 the Society opposed the passing of Dr. Brewer's Private Slaughter-houses Bill, and placed on the seat of every member of the House of Commons a document urging the abolition of private slaughter-houses. The Society also had an inspection made of all the 1,500 slaughter-houses in London for the purpose of laying the results of their inquiries before the Government.

In the following year two agents of the Society paid daily visits to the slaughter-houses in London, and, using the knowledge thus gained, the Society drew attention to the need of reforms.

The first demonstration of improved methods of slaughtering oxen was given in 1875, and during that year and the two following years much attention was paid to the matter. Reports of the trials showed that much cruelty could be prevented only by the establishment of public slaughter-houses. The Society issued 20,000 copies of a pamphlet on the various methods of slaughtering animals and petitioned Parliament to abolish private slaughter-houses.

In 1882 a society—afterwards named the London Model Abattoir Society—was formed for providing sanitary and humane methods of killing animals for food. At the first meeting, held at the R.S.P.C.A. offices, Mr. Colam, the secretary, drew attention to the large number of private slaughter-houses in

London. Although R.S.P.C.A. inspectors were not permitted to enter private slaughter-houses they occasionally found a way of being present when animals were being slaughtered, and the Society had good reason for believing that cruelty was rife in those places.

In 1885 Mr. Bruce (afterwards Lord Aberdare), President of the Society, endeavoured in vain to overcome trade interests and prejudices while trying to secure the passing of a measure which, if it had become law, would have led to the erection of public abattoirs throughout London.

We turn again to the Society's efforts to discover an instrument for the humane killing of animals. A new appliance for casting bullocks—one of the processes of the Jewish method of slaughtering—was tested by the Society in 1893, and at an important trial of various slaughtering instruments held at Leipzig the Society was represented by Professor Hunting, F.R.C.V.S. No improved instrument was forthcoming until 1895, when Mr. Greener, of 68, Haymarket, acting as agent for a Swiss inventor, Mr. Stahl, of Zurich, introduced a pistol for slaughtering cattle. The barrel of the pistol was fixed into a disc. The instrument was tried at Deptford, but was not entirely satisfactory, and the inventor set to work to improve it. This killer has been in use at Carlisle Abattoir, under the management of Mr. Dodds, ever since 1901. Soon afterwards a Mr. Behr invented a pistol firing a "captive bolt" for killing animals.

In 1904 a Departmental Committee, under the presidency of Mr. Arthur Lee, Civil Lord of the Admiralty,* was formed to inquire into the best

* Now Lord Lee of Fareham.

methods of slaughtering animals for human food. Mr. Colam, secretary of the Society, gave evidence, and many instruments from the Society's museum were shown to the committee, who stated in their report that they were of the opinion that the method of slaughtering in this country was capable of considerable improvement, and they came to the following conclusions :

1. All animals should be stunned before blood is drawn.

2. Highly desirable that where circumstances permit private slaughter-houses should be replaced by public abattoirs.

3. There should be an efficient inspection and supervision of all slaughter-houses.

4. All slaughtermen should be licensed by the local authorities.

The committee made other recommendations—namely, that calves should first be stunned by a blow on the head with a club and that sheep should also be stunned with a club with a heavy head. The committee were also of opinion that preliminary stunning should be enforced in pig killing. The committee disapproved of the Jewish method of slaughter.

In the following year the Society induced the Jewish slaughterers of Aldgate to “pith” calves directly after their throats were cut. By this time the work which the Society was doing in trying to induce humane methods of killing animals had extended in so many directions that it became necessary to appoint a sub-committee to deal with the subject. This committee strongly endorsed the recommendations of the Admiralty Committee of

1904 and collected evidence from slaughter-houses at home and abroad. Many experiments were made and alterations in the methods of slaughter recommended. The committee drew up a report of their work and sent copies to all Medical Officers of Health and Members of Parliament.

In 1907 the R.S.P.C.A. humane cattle killer was invented. This instrument owed its existence, in a sense, to the Boer War. Captain Derriman (general secretary 1905-1908), its inventor, had been a transport officer in South Africa. In the course of his duties he frequently had to have disabled trek-oxen destroyed, an operation which was usually effected with the help of a service revolver. But occasionally it was difficult to use the weapon at close quarters. This difficulty suggested the idea of attaching a pistol barrel to a shaft, which enabled the operator to stand clear of the animal when firing.

The killer is a simple instrument. At the end of a pole some three feet long is fixed at right angles to the shaft a pistol barrel of large calibre. The appliance can be held by the slaughterman standing at one side and clear of the animal, and is fired by means of a wire passing down the core of the pole. The successful use of the killer does not depend on the personal strength, skill, or nerve of the slaughterman; a woman or child could use it. No more strength is needed than is required to hold the apparatus and to pull the trigger, no more skill than to place the muzzle on the proper spot on the animal's head.

Until this instrument was perfected butchers were always able to put forward two reasons why they should not use one of the various instruments which

had been invented for shooting cattle. First, none of those instruments employed a projectile of sufficient size to enable the pithing cane to be inserted.* The animal, therefore, had to be pole-axed after it had been shot in order to enable the pithing to be carried out, and this plan took up a considerable amount of time.

The second objection to the use of a pistol or gun was its difficulty. Cattle resented people standing in front of them; they became frightened and restless, and would not stand still to be shot. The R.S.P.C.A. humane killer overcomes these two objections. The advantage of the instrument as compared with other instruments having no shaft is that the slaughterer can stand well at the side of the animal and therefore out of reach of the horns. An operator using the Greener cattle killer (as originally designed) or Swedish killer also stands at the side, extends his arms a little to place the instrument, and taps with the other hand; but he is often in close proximity to the horns, and has to be careful to avoid risk.

Trials of the R.S.P.C.A. humane killer were made at the Metropolitan Cattle Market, Islington, before Professor Hunting, F.R.C.V.S. (chief veterinary inspector to the London County Council), Mr. F. W. Wragg, F.R.C.V.S., and Mr. James King, M.R.C.V.S. (superintendent of the Metropolitan Cattle Markets and Slaughter-houses and veterinary

* After an animal is shot through the head and is quite insensible, some time elapses before movement altogether ceases, unless the reflex action of the nerves is destroyed. In slaughter-houses this is done by inserting a cane through a hole made in the skull and twisting it round two or three times. The beast cannot safely be dressed until this is done.

inspector to the Corporation of the City of London). Their report was as follows :

“The requirements of an efficient and safe appliance are :

“1. That it should allow the operator to stand at the side of the animal and enable him to place the instrument exactly upon the spot where perforation is required.

“2. That it will instantaneously injure the brain to an extent insuring immediate and lasting insensibility.

“3. That it will either itself cause loss of involuntary motion or permit the use of a cane to effect that purpose.

“The R.S.P.C.A. humane killer more nearly conforms to all these requirements than any other appliance we have seen. The R.S.P.C.A. humane killer never fails to penetrate, and for producing unconsciousness in the ordinary animals used for food we consider it the most efficient, simple, and safe appliance we have seen for use in a slaughter-house.”

Trials of the killer made in the cattle markets in other parts of the country were also entirely satisfactory, and then was started the uphill task of persuading butchers to use the instrument. The butchers would not have it; they said that an animal killed by an explosive would not bleed properly. To this the Society replied: “If you suffer any loss through using the humane killer we will compensate you.” But no claim has ever been made! Within a short time of the invention of the instrument 5,000 animals had been killed by it, and no claim for compensation had been made.

In 1908 the Local Government Board issued a

circular to local authorities drawing attention to the recommendations of the Admiralty Committee and suggesting the universal enforcement of the following regulations :

“(a) All animals, without exception, must be stunned, or otherwise rendered unconscious, before the blood is drawn.

“(b) Animals awaiting slaughter must be so placed that they cannot see into the slaughter-house, and the doors of the latter must be kept closed whilst slaughtering is going on.

“(c) The drainage of the slaughter-house must be so arranged that no blood or other refuse can flow within sight or smell of animals awaiting slaughter, and no such refuse shall be deposited in proximity to the waiting pens.

“(d) If more animals than one are being slaughtered in one slaughter-house at the same time they must not be within view of each other.

“(e) None but the licensed men shall be employed in or about slaughter-houses.”

These suggestions and the recommendations of the Admiralty Committee were ignored, but the Society continued its task of trying to break down the prejudiced opposition of the trade to the use of an instrument that would kill a beast cleanly, painlessly, and instantaneously, and by 1911 800 humane killers were in use in private and public slaughter-houses, and other instruments for humanely killing animals had been invented.

Nowhere in England was the humane method of killing more quickly and firmly established than in Stroud. The credit of converting the butchers of

Stroud and the surrounding district was due to the untiring labours of Mr. R. O. P. Paddison, the honorary humane slaughtering adviser to the Society. At the present time the number of butchers of all kinds—family butchers, wholesale butchers, bacon curers, pork butchers, Co-operative societies, jobbing butchers, and others—in the district of Stroud and its surroundings in the Severn Valley, who regularly use the humane killer of their own free will, is fifty-three.

During the war little work could be done to bring about slaughter-house reforms. It was almost impossible to obtain new instruments or to have old ones repaired. The question of ammunition was also very difficult. In spite of these difficulties, however, the sale of the humane killers slowly increased.

In 1915 the Ministry of Health issued some model by-laws for the regulation of slaughter-houses, of which the most important from the point of view of the Society was Clause 9 (b), which is as follows :

“A person shall not in a slaughter-house proceed to slaughter any animal until the same shall have been effectually stunned, and such stunning shall, except as hereinafter provided, be effected with a mechanically operated instrument suitable and sufficient for the purpose.

“Provided that this by-law so far as it would require the stunning of sheep and the use of a mechanically operated instrument shall not apply until the expiration of three months from and after the date of the confirmation of these by-laws.

“Provided further that this by-law shall not be deemed to apply to any member of the Jewish faith,

duly licensed by the Chief Rabbi as a slaughterer, when engaged in the slaughtering of cattle intended for the food of Jews according to the Jewish method of slaughtering, if no unnecessary suffering is inflicted."

Immediately after the war the Society set to work to induce public bodies to adopt these model by-laws, thus compelling all the butchers in a district in which the by-laws had been adopted to use humane methods in killing their animals, but at the time of writing, for reasons perhaps best known to themselves, many butchers oppose the use of humane killing instruments. In 1921 the National Federation of Meat Traders' Associations endeavoured to upset the by-laws making humane slaughtering compulsory, but the Minister of Health, after hearing the evidence of deputations from the Society and from the Federation, declined to alter the clauses relating to the humane killing of animals, and has continued to confirm the adoption of the humane by-law referred to above.

These by-laws, at the time of writing, have been adopted, in spite of the opposition of the National Federation of Meat Traders' Associations, by 103 local authorities, including such important towns as Southampton, Portsmouth, and Plymouth. The London County Council, after careful inquiry into the matter by its Public Health Committee, also adopted the by-law.

Many butchers have voluntarily adopted the use of the killers recommended by the Society after having witnessed actual demonstrations by the Society's trained representative. These killers are the R.S.P.C.A. killer, the Greener "Safeti" killer, the Cash captive-bolt pistol, and the Swedish killer. The

Society's officials test all these instruments before issue, and also sell to the users the requisite cartridges. It is comforting to those who are anxious for the spread of humane slaughter to know that the sale of these instruments and cartridges are greatly on the increase. For example, while 606 killers were supplied to butchers in 1922, the sales in 1923 were 793, and of the cartridges the figures are as follows: in 1920, 126,000 were sold; in 1921, 195,000; in 1922, 335,000; and in 1923, 357,000. This is irrefutable evidence as to the growing use of humane methods in slaughtering animals for food.

In January 1922, upon a prosecution by the Town Council of Reading for a breach of the by-laws, the magistrates refused to convict. In June the matter came before a divisional court, which unanimously held that the decision of the magistrates could not be supported and remitted the case to them with a direction to convict. The Lord Chief Justice pointed out that local authorities were not only entitled but were under a statutory obligation to make by-laws for the prevention of cruelty, and expressed the strong opinion of the court that the by-law before them—*i.e.*, Model Clause 9 (b)—was a proper by-law for the purpose.

No account of the Society's campaign to bring about the humane killing of animals required for food would be complete without acknowledgment, with great gratitude, of the immense assistance the Society has received from Mr. Christopher Cash, now honorary secretary of the Society's branch at Coventry. In the early days of the campaign Mr. Christopher Cash and his brother gave their time and their money unstintingly "for the good of the cause."

They made many costly experiments with killers at the time when the instruments were being perfected, and Mr. Christopher Cash now has the satisfaction of knowing that his own instrument—the Cash captive-bolt pistol—is being used successfully in many parts of the country.

CHAPTER XII

THE SOCIETY AND VIVISECTION

THE Society from the earliest time of its foundation recognized the cruelties of unrestricted vivisection, and reference to it is made in the prospectus of the Society which was drawn up at that historic first meeting at Old Slaughter's Coffee House, in the following words :

“ We allude to the practice of dissecting animals alive, or lacerating, mutilating, and inflicting torture upon them in various modes, to satisfy an unprofitable curiosity. However justifiable it may be to conduct certain experiments of a painful nature, under the control of a benevolent mind, with a view to determine some important question in science, not otherwise attainable, yet all must agree ‘ that Providence cannot intend that the secrets of Nature should be discovered by means of cruelty.’ ”

It is of little avail to speculate as to who inspired those words, but it is probable that Richard Martin had a hand in the composition. Certainly they must have had his cordial approval, for his mind was turned to the subject, and on February 24, 1825, he spoke of it in the House of Commons. In the course of a speech, when moving for leave to bring in a Bill to prevent bear-baiting and other cruel practices, he drew the attention of the House to a series of experiments on a dog, “ so atrocious as almost to shake belief,” performed in this country by a French physiologist of the name of Magendie, concerning which

the official reporter inserts the comment: "Great disgust at the statement of this cruel experiment was manifested by the House." Martin is reported in Hansard to have added: "He was aware of the necessity of making some experiments on living animals; but then they should be performed in such a manner as to cause as little suffering as possible. That was the opinion of the most eminent professors. He held in his hand the written declarations of Mr. Abernethy and Sir Everard Home, of the Professors of Medicine at Cambridge and Oxford, and of several other respectable medical gentlemen to that effect. They all united in condemnation of such excessive cruelty." Subsequently, at the first anniversary meeting of the Society, held on June 29, 1825, Martin said that he had been misrepresented, and that he did not approve of cruelty to a living animal under any circumstances.

To give Magendie the opportunity of bringing an action for slander against him if his accusation could not be substantiated, Martin stated at the second reading of the Bill that he had that day been to St. Bartholomew's Hospital and had there repeated in public the statement he had already made in the House of Commons. There is no record that the challenge was accepted by the accused.

The subject was frequently discussed at meetings in the early days of the Society, and at the annual meeting in 1847, the Bishop of St. Davids suggested that it might be possible to secure "some legislative regulation to prevent the practice of vivisection." He suggested that some system of public and private inspection might be practicable.

The Society was willing to listen to both sides of the question, and a medical man was permitted to put his

views before the Society at its annual meeting in 1848. He maintained that experiments on living animals were justifiable, but the wanton repetition of them was unjustifiable. When one complete and satisfactory result had been obtained there the matter should end.

Nevertheless, the total prohibition of vivisection was put into the programme of the Society's work, and its supporters were not content with trying to stop the practice in this country. In 1860, the Society endeavoured to persuade the French people to give up making experiments on living animals, and two deputations from the Society went to Paris and were received by the Emperor, who expressed his appreciation of their motives, his great sympathy with the views of the Society, his surprise at the existence of some of the practices, of which he said he had been ignorant, and promised that an inquiry into the subject should be made. The Emperor kept his word; a commission was appointed to inquire into the subject, and eventually the practice was forbidden in all the French veterinary schools.

Encouraged by this success, the Society opened a special fund for the purpose of conducting a campaign against vivisection, and in 1863 an international congress was held at the Crystal Palace "to discuss the general subject of cruelty to animals, and especially vivisection and other operations on living animals for the purpose of instruction in surgery." Representatives of several Continental societies attended.

Speaking at the annual meeting of the Society in that year, the President, the Earl of Harrowby, referred to vivisection as being perhaps the most important subject they had to deal with, but he suggested that it would be going too far to say that no pain

should be inflicted either upon man or animals, if by such experiments science was to produce benefits upon man.

Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson contended that, under proper regulations, experiments on animals were necessary. He felt that animals must be employed for the perfection of a discovery that should render the process of anæsthesia, or the prevention of pain in surgical operations, free from danger.

The chairman expressed the opinion that after anæsthetics were administered and insensibility followed, there could be no cruelty, because there was no pain.

Sir Benjamin added that experiments were also essential for finding an efficient treatment for cases of suspended animation, as in drowning, and for other reasons.

The Society subsequently offered a prize of £50 for the best essay on the subject. Many of the essays received advocated the practice. The majority, however, recommended either the entire abolition of the practice or its prohibition, except when performed "by recognized and distinguished experimenters."

In 1874, the Society took legal proceedings against some medical men who had performed some experiments on two dogs. The case lasted two days, and was then dismissed. The Bench commended the action of the Society and refused the defendants' application for costs.

Early in 1875, the Society received a memorial signed by over 1,000 people, headed by the Archbishop of York, praying that the Society would undertake the task of placing suitable restrictions on this "rapidly increasing evil." A special committee of

the Society was formed for considering the memorial and the best means of acting upon it.

Later in the year, a Royal Commission to inquire into the subject was appointed, and Mr. Colam, the secretary of the Society, gave evidence. He said that the Society had put their wishes into the form of a Bill, the chief clause in which was that no person should perform, cause to be performed, or take part in performing any operation on any animal without first of all rendering it insensible to pain, and in the case of such an operation the animal was to be destroyed before the effect of the anæsthetic ceased.

Mr. Colam admitted that there were members of the Society whose views might be different from those expressed in the Bill. Some would prohibit all experiments, others desired that no Bill should be framed, believing the present statutes sufficient to suppress cruel experiments. The Society's Bill proposed that all places where operations were carried on should be licensed.

It must have been obvious to the friends of the Society that the Society could not take one, and only one, view on this subject. The Society's members held at least six different views. There were :

1. Vegetarians, who objected to animal food and animal destruction.

2. Meat eaters, who objected to experiments on living creatures.

3. Meat eaters, who did not object to the experiments said by physiologists to be necessary when it was absolutely certain that they did not cause any pain.

4. Those who thought that the interest of human beings demanded the occasional infliction of suffering

on animals, and objected therefore to limiting the doctors to painless experiments, although they wished to protect animals liable to vivisection.

5. Those who declined to consider the subject on the ground of pain, and while anxious to prevent wanton and reckless suffering, were willing to leave the nature and number of experiments to the discretion of the physiologists.

6. Those who were prepared to tolerate any amount of pain made by vivisectors "in the interests of general humanity."

The Royal Commission came to the conclusion that painful experiments were necessary for original research. All the medical witnesses, except two, declared that experiments were indispensable. The Royal Commission also countenanced vivisection for teaching purposes, when the experiments were performed without pain.

The Government introduced a Bill based on the recommendations of the Royal Commission, but before it was passed, the Home Secretary received a deputation from the Society headed by the Earl of Harrowby, the President. Among friends of the Society present at the deputation was Cardinal Manning, who said that he did not deny that the power to take the lives of the lower animals contained power also to inflict inevitable pain, but he entirely denied it carried the power to inflict unnecessary pain.

The Bill was passed, bearing title "The Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876," and with the following preamble:

"Whereas it is expedient to amend the law relating to cruelty to animals by extending it to the cases of animals which for medical, physiological, or other

scientific purposes are subjected when alive to experiments calculated to inflict pain."

The Act, therefore, purported to be an Act for the further protection of animals, and, accordingly, the marginal note to Section 2 reads: "Prohibition of painful experiments on animals." Nevertheless, by subsequent clauses provision was made enabling persons, held to be duly qualified, to perform experiments on living animals "calculated to give pain," under licence by the Home Secretary, and certificates granted by scientific bodies as by the Act specified. The Act, therefore, permitted vivisection under certain conditions therein mentioned.

From time to time the Society contended that the Act was not properly administered and that it needed amendment. The Society was not satisfied with the way in which the Government inspector made his reports on experiments, and it appealed to the Home Secretary to devise some better method of supervising the performance of operations.

The Society lost no opportunity in pointing out that by the Act only one inspector was appointed to make the returns of operations, and that there were fifty licensees in the country. It was therefore impossible for the inspector to attend on all the occasions when the experiments were being made.

Speaking at the annual meeting of the Society in 1892, Lord Aberdare, the President, said:

"While our Society proceeds against wanton cruelty, or cruelty due to motives of interest, the action of the anti-vivisection societies is directed against proceedings which have not for their object any such motives, but which, whether in principle right or wrong, are carried on with the undoubted purpose

of alleviating the sufferings of our fellow-creatures, whether human or animal. . . . With respect to vivisection . . . our Society is now censured, in terms not only severe, but contumelious, for not undertaking duties which are at the present time vigorously performed by institutions established and supported with the avowed aim of preventing the practice, and with that object only. I am convinced that our course is quite clear, and that if we were weak enough to give way to the threats and reproaches so copiously showered upon us, we should introduce into the Society an element of discord which would develop and greatly diminish our power for good, even if it did not lead to more disastrous consequences. . . . Recent legislation has, I rejoice to say, put a stop to all the grosser forms of cruelty in conducting experiments on living animals, and we, as a Society, have brought all our influence to bear in the direction of preventing or alleviating, by all the resources of science, operations which involved pain."

Lord Aberdare added that he was with those who wished to put down all operations involving pain, but further than that he was not prepared to go.

In September, 1893, Lieut-Colonel Mark Lockwood, M.P. (now Lord Lambourne, the present chairman of the Society), called the attention of the House of Commons to the great increase in the number of experiments, and urged that the inspection under the Act should be more thorough.

The Home Secretary, in reply, said that only two or three cases had come under his notice in which the experiments violated the conditions of the licence. When that happened, the most severe notice was taken of it, and unless a satisfactory explanation was forth-

coming, the renewal of the licence was refused. If there had been an increase in the number of the experiments there had not been an increase in the amount of pain inflicted on animals during the last year. The large increase in the number of experiments was almost entirely due to inoculation. This was performed without anæsthetics because it was perfectly painless. It was a rigid condition of the certificate that, if pain supervened after the experiment, the animal was to be at once killed.

Later in the year, and in the following year, the Society presented petitions praying that there might be a more thorough and efficient inspection of all experiments on living animals.

The Society had repeatedly called attention to the fact that the returns made by the experimenters themselves had, in some instances, been the only means by which the Government inspectors had been enabled to make their reports. The Society contended that the Legislature intended the inspection to be personal.

At the annual meeting in 1899, the Society unanimously passed a resolution protesting against the enormous increase in the number of experiments, and pledging itself to use all available means for securing the reduction of such experiments, and the absolute prohibition of all painful experiments on animals.

In 1906, a Royal Commission was appointed—the terms of reference being “to inquire into and report upon the practice of subjecting all living animals to experiments, whether by vivisection or otherwise, and also to inquire into the law relating to that practice and its administration, and to report whether any, and if so, what, changes are desirable.”

The Society was invited to appear before the Royal

Commission, and the then chairman (Sir Guillum Scott), accompanied by a member of the Council (Sir Frederick Banbury, M.P., now Lord Banbury of Southam), responded to the invitation on December 11, 1907, when they were examined on the following précis of evidence :

“ The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was founded to protect animals generally, and not for the suppression of any kind of cruelty in particular.

“ The members of the Society are drawn from all classes, and there is a considerable difference of opinion amongst some of them upon various subjects, although on others they are practically agreed. On the question of vivisection, for instance, there is a wide diversity of opinion, many persons objecting to any kind of vivisection, while others object only to painful experiments ; others, again, consider that vivisection is necessary for the advancement of science in the interests of mankind.

“ The attitude taken up by the Society, almost since its foundation, has been that it deprecates all experiments on animals which cause pain, but as regards experiments which cause no pain there is no ground for interference by the Society, because the question of cruelty does not arise. The Society, therefore, is of the opinion that all severely painful experiments should be carried out while the animal in question is completely under the influence of an anæsthetic, and that it should be destroyed before the effect of the anæsthetic has been removed.

“ The Society has, ever since the passing of the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876, repeatedly pointed out that the supervision of experiments carried on under

licences granted under that Act is totally inadequate. It may not be possible that every experiment should be performed in the presence of an inspector, but all those should be which cause pain, either in their initial stages or afterwards. All severely painful experiments should only be performed in a particular place or places, so as to facilitate inspection; and all painful experiments should be prohibited except in the presence of an inspector.

“The number of experiments has increased since 1876 from between three and four hundred in that year, to over 46,000 in 1906, and the number of inspectors (originally two and now three) is entirely out of proportion to the increase in the number of experiments. The number of inspectors is absolutely inadequate if a proper supervision is to be exercised over the licensees. The inspectors occasionally witness experiments, but very few.

“The inspectors’ reports are drawn up from the information culled from the reports made to them by the licensees.

“It is impossible for the inspectors to exercise proper supervision while experiments are going on every day in all parts of the country.

“The Society is strongly of opinion that additional inspectors, who shall not necessarily consist of medical men, should be appointed; and that such inspectors should visit all licensed places frequently, at various times, unknown to the licensees; and that all holders of licences should be required to declare that no experiments, except those duly reported in accordance with the terms of the licence, have been performed; and the licensees should be required to make a return of all animals acquired by them and how obtained.

“With a view of securing and maintaining the confidence of the public, the necessity of obtaining the consent of the Home Secretary, for the prosecution of a licensee for an alleged offence should be abolished, and it should be left to the discretion of the magistrates, who are empowered to refuse a process if they consider an application is vexatious.

“The period for taking proceedings should be extended so as to be within six months of the publication, or the giving information of that which is impugned.”

The Royal Commission did not issue its final report until 1912. The Commission came to the conclusion that “experiments upon animals, adequately safeguarded by law and faithfully administered, are morally justifiable and should not be prohibited by legislation.” The Commission recommended: “(1) An increase to the inspectorate; (2) further limitations as regards the use of curare; (3) stricter provisions as to the definition and practice of pithing; (4) additional restrictions regulating the painless destruction of animals which show signs of suffering after experiment; (5) a change in the method of selecting and in the constitution of the advisory body to the Secretary of State; (6) special records by experimenters in certain cases.”

Lieut.-Colonel Mark Lockwood, M.P. (now Lord Lambourne), was a member of the Royal Commission on Vivisection. Lord Lambourne has twice attempted, without success, to secure the passing of a measure to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission, including those contained in the reservation memorandum signed by himself, Sir William Collins, and Dr. Wilson.

It will be readily understood how controversial this subject is when it is realized that no fewer than fourteen different societies gave evidence before the Royal Commission, each expounding views of varying shades of opinion.

It should be remembered, since the Society is sometimes called inconsistent because it prosecutes a costermonger for driving a lame donkey while it does not prosecute a licensed vivisector, that the Society can only prosecute on direct evidence, which it has to produce in all its cases.

It should be added that the Council of the Society has, on several occasions, reaffirmed the principle enunciated by the Society's representatives before the Royal Commission of 1906, to the effect that the Society "deprecates all experiments on animals which cause pain."

CHAPTER XIII

THE SOCIETY AND THE GREAT WAR

It is consoling, when one recalls the important part played by animals in the war, to record that during all that period of intense strain, suffering, and sorrow, there was a strong feeling that while much should be done for the benefit of fit horses in the army, the care of the sick and wounded animals should also be practically dealt with.

In former campaigns, the wastage of horses was commented upon, but little or nothing was done for their amelioration. During the Crimean War, for instance, the awful wastage of animal life was hardly considered. This can be understood when one remembers that until the heroic labour of Florence Nightingale had aroused the nation, the sick and dying soldiers were inadequately cared for.

At the commencement of the Franco-Prussian War (1870), the Society addressed a memorial to the Governments of the belligerents praying for the organization of slaughtering services, so that horses badly wounded on the battlefield might be shot. The proposal was acted upon by the Germans so far as to appoint *one* official horse slaughterer, whose duty it was to put injured horses out of their misery. When one pictures the extent of the battle zone, one can estimate the futility of appointing one man where hundreds could have been busily engaged in their work of mercy.

As soon as the South African War (1899-1902) broke out, the Society endeavoured to mitigate the sufferings of badly wounded horses, and received assurances from the War Office that directions should be given to troopers to end mercifully the lives of all severely wounded animals instead of abandoning them to a lingering death. The authorities were, however, unable to entertain the Society's suggestion that a special corps should be organized to do this work, and they suggested that nothing more could be done until some international convention extended to those who cared for wounded animals the same protection for which the Geneva Convention provided in the case of men, and intimated that the Society should turn its efforts in that direction.

The Society acted upon that suggestion, and subsequently, in 1901, John Colam, secretary R.S.P.C.A., visited the Swiss President, who said that he would give the matter all the support in his power, since he was, personally, thoroughly in sympathy with the idea.

As a result of this promised support, the R.S.P.C.A. addressed letters to all S.P.C.A.s throughout the world, urging the co-operation of their respective Governments to raise the subject at the approaching Geneva Convention, with a view to the extension of the Geneva Convention for the alleviation of horses badly wounded on the battlefield. Owing to the outbreak of various wars, however, the Geneva Convention had continually to be postponed, and so no opportunity occurred for the consideration of this recommendation.

But during all that time, and subsequently, public opinion was steadily advancing in its desire to prevent

unnecessary suffering to animals under all conditions, and, as a result, in August, 1914, public solicitude was aroused for the welfare of the animals—whether they were cattle, dogs or cats left behind by the fleeing inhabitants of a threatened district, or animals used by the various combatants.

In connection with the care given to the horses and mules of the British Army during the Great War, it must be remembered that at the commencement of hostilities our army had only a small Army Veterinary Corps—formed as a result of the experience of the South African War. During that war there had been only a department consisting of a few officers and civil veterinary surgeons, whose duties for all practical purposes were limited to professional attendance upon such sick animals as chanced to come within their narrow scope.

The Army Veterinary Corps in 1914 consisted of 109 officers and 322 other ranks, including reservists. At the close of hostilities this important service had increased to 1,300 officers and 27,000 other ranks, excluding 6,000 coloured men employed in the various theatres of war in looking after questions of health and disease as affecting all classes of army animals. The necessity for caring for the sick and wounded animals had at last been recognized and had been adequately dealt with.

Immediately when war was declared in August, 1914, the R.S.P.C.A. offered its services to the War Office in any way in which such services could be utilized for the benefit of the horses of the British Army. This offer was courteously declined on the ground that the organization of the Army Veterinary Corps was so full and complete that no outside assist-

ance was necessary in dealing with the care of sick and wounded horses. In these circumstances, the Society rendered all the help it could by encouraging many of its inspectors to enlist in the Army Veterinary Corps, and by supplying horse ambulances and other requisites, whenever asked for, to various units in training at home. It was found that the R.S.P.C.A. inspectors, by reason of their knowledge of horses, combined with habits of discipline, were so valuable to the Army Veterinary Corps, that the Society was asked to allow as many as possible of its men to join, and they rapidly received promotion.

After three months of war, the strain on the Army Veterinary Department was so great that, on November 5, 1914, the Army Council wrote that they would be grateful for "further assistance in helping to provide trained veterinary subordinates, who are willing to enlist in the Army Veterinary Corps," and, further, that they approved of "a fund being started by the Society for the purchase of hospital requisites for sick and wounded horses."

In consequence of this, the R.S.P.C.A. collected and trained over 200 men, apart from its own inspectors, who had some knowledge of horses, and who were willing to enlist in the Army Veterinary Corps; and a fund was at once started, under the chairmanship of the Duke of Portland, K.G., to work as an auxiliary to the Army Veterinary Corps, under the control of the War Office. The fund was at once asked to supply the following for immediate requirements :

Shelters for horses under treatment, to accommodate 2,000; 30-cwt. motor-lorries for the veterinary hospitals; 10 motor-waggon; 9 corn-crushers and

chaff-cutters combined, with petrol engines; 5,000 rugs, old or new, if in good condition; 5,000 head collars; 5,000 halters, besides bandages, etc.

Within a very short time, the majority of these requisites were supplied, owing to the generosity of the public. It may be mentioned that Her Majesty Queen Alexandra, realizing the good work that was being done, sent various donations to the fund, and her example was followed by every class of the community, from the millionaire to the working-man.

In order to prevent any misconception in regard to the authority of the R.S.P.C.A. fund to work on behalf of British horses at the Front, especially as various other funds were being opened for the same purpose, a question was asked in the House of Commons on June 23, 1915, when Mr. Tennant, Under Secretary for War, stated:

“The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is the only society recognized and authorized by the Army Council to collect funds for the provision of comforts for horses in veterinary hospitals. The expenditure of the money thus collected is under the direction of the War Office. The offers of other societies have not been accepted.”

In spite of that statement so much misconception arose in the public mind as to the various organizations claiming to work on behalf of the sick and wounded British Army horses, that a further statement was deemed necessary. Accordingly, in the House of Commons, on April 6, 1916, Mr. Anderson asked the Under Secretary of State for War if he could state how many societies were at present collecting funds in this country to ameliorate the treatment

and condition of horses engaged in warfare; whether the present arrangements involved overlapping and waste of money and effort; and whether it was proposed to take any steps to obtain greater efficiency, co-ordination, and control.

The following answer was given by Mr. Tennant, the Under Secretary for War :

“ I am aware that funds are being collected in this country by more than one society, but I do not know by how many. It is desirable that it should be known that the only society authorized by the War Office to collect funds and co-ordinate offers of assistance for horses of the British Army is the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, to which all contributions, gifts, and offers of assistance should be addressed. I may add that this society is working in close connection with the Army Veterinary Department. I agree with my hon. friend that the collection of funds by more than one society involves waste of effort. The remedy is, I think, for the public to appreciate fully the fact that the authorized society for this purpose is the one I have mentioned.”

The Society realized at the outset that work for the animals on the battlefields could only be done effectively if organized as a department of the Army, by a personnel specially trained for the purpose, and under military orders. Therefore the committee of the fund concentrated their attention on the provision of horse hospitals, horse ambulances, motor-lorries for the carriage of fodder, etc., corn-crushers and chaff-cutters, rugs, bandages, and other requirements. The generous public immediately responded to the appeal, and within a very short time £50,000 had

been received. This sum was quickly spent in the ever-growing needs of the animals on the various Fronts and at home in remount camps.

The Society had also been of practical assistance to the authorities at home in helping to train the recruits. It was found that many men of the new army were drawn from business life and had little or no knowledge of horses. By the courtesy of commanding officers in various districts throughout the country, the Society's technical lecturer was allowed to give lectures and demonstrations on the care and management of horses. These lectures were found of great benefit, and in the course of the first eighteen months of the war 250 lectures and demonstrations were given to 55,000 men.

The special usefulness of the fund lay in the fact that it was able to attend to the needs of horses quickly and without any of the delay which might have occurred if requests for supplies had been dealt with only by the War Office departments, which at that time were much overworked and had naturally to attend to the needs of men before considering the needs of animals. The fund committee had also been able to introduce many aids to the work which had not hitherto been supplied or considered to be necessary. During 1916, Field-Marshal Lord French (now the Earl of Ypres), Commander-in-Chief of the British Armies in France, wrote :

"I take this opportunity of tendering my best appreciation and thanks for the very valuable assistance which the Society has rendered to the Army Veterinary Corps in alleviating animal suffering and preventing wastage of animal life."

Early in 1915, the chief secretary of the Society was invited to pay a visit to the French Front and inspect the arrangements made for the care of the animals, with a view to seeing what was required and what could be provided by the fund. A report of this visit appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* (August, 1915) entitled "The Cinderella of the Service," and as a result much public sympathy was aroused and money poured in. In justice to the Army Veterinary Corps and the difficulties which had to be overcome in the early days of the war, it must be remembered that with the retreat from Mons and the shifting tide of battle, all the well-thought-out plans for hospital accommodation were rudely upset. During the whole of the first winter it was a continual fight against rain, mud and cold, with no better shelter for sick animals than could be found in woods or in unsuitable farm-buildings. Therefore, brickfields, mills, and deserted kilns had to be hastily adapted, and the R.S.P.C.A. fund was particularly useful at this juncture in being able to provide the necessary materials. The first hospital, to accommodate 2,000 patients, was erected at Forges-les-Eaux, and this work, under the admirable supervision of General Sir John Moore, Director of Veterinary Services, voluntarily aided by Mr. A. H. Fass, grew apace and eventually the Society was able to make provision for thirteen hospitals, accommodating in all 13,500 horses. Each hospital was complete with operating theatre, forage barns, dressing-sheds, etc., besides suitable accommodation for officers and men. The fund also provided a complete convalescent-horse depôt and tented hospitals to accommodate 6,800 horses; 180 horse ambulances were also provided,

besides 26 motor-driven horse ambulances at a cost of over £1,000 each, thousands of loin-cloths, chaff-cutters and corn-crushers, and countless minor requirements of the service.

The men of the Corps in charge of the hospitals had also to be remembered, for, as was stated in the *Nineteenth Century* article, already referred to, "there is a humanizing element about these hospitals for sick and wounded horses which works for good, and is bound to react on the men who act as dressers, orderlies, etc. And one can realize this, for instance, from the many brave horticultural attempts made by these men who, from five o'clock in the morning, are kept busy with the work which makes up the day of a member of an organized staff. Many of the hospitals boast of landscape gardeners of no mean skill, and kind friends, or the men themselves, have provided plants and seeds for the purpose. Where such have not been forthcoming, it was almost touching to see the optimism of the gardeners, who have transplanted wild flowers and plants to add the feeling of home to their new surroundings. It would be a wrong policy, surely, to attend to the needs of the patients and neglect those of the large staff necessary to man these hospitals, and therefore much has been done to help them enjoy their brief leisure. Canteens and recreation tents, with papers, games, books, etc., have been provided by the R.S.P.C.A., and many others interested in the Corps, and the men themselves, drawn from various callings, are able to give excellent smoking concerts, etc. This is a side of the important work which is as necessary for the good treatment of the animals as it is for the well-being of the men themselves, since it keeps them in good health and good



THE R.S.P.C.A. SICK AND WOUNDED WAR HORSES FUND.
One of the forty motor ambulances, presented by the R.S.P.C.A., in
regular use.



A VIEW OF ONE OF THE DEPOTS FOR CONVALESCENT HORSES.

spirits, and so reacts on their work and makes them proud of the Corps to which they belong.”

In 1915, the Society allowed its chief secretary (Captain E. G. Fairholme) to receive temporary commission in the Army Veterinary Corps and to proceed to France to assist in the administrative work arising out of the supply of hospital buildings and requisites sent over by the R.S.P.C.A. from England. He was appointed Deputy Assistant Director of Veterinary Services, under the Director of Veterinary Services (General Sir John Moore), with the British Expeditionary Force. On completion of this duty, at the end of 1916, Captain Fairholme returned to the Society's headquarters in London to take over again the regular administration of the Society's work and for the remainder of the war to collect contributions for the fund to aid the work of the Royal Army Veterinary Corps.

There were many difficulties involved during the later part of the war in obtaining material for hospital buildings, vehicles, etc. Permits had to be obtained for the release of such essential materials as steel, motor-chassis, etc., so that the provision of one motor-driven horse ambulance, for instance, involved a quantity of clerical work and personal effort, in all of which the secretarial staff of the R.S.P.C.A. greatly assisted. Up to the end of March, 1919, the Society spent nearly £200,000 in providing contributions to the material welfare of army animals.

The army authorities realized from the experience gained during the Great War that the value of an organized society like the R.S.P.C.A., as an auxiliary to the Army Veterinary Service in time of war, was very great. There are naturally many kinds of

material on the border-line between luxuries and necessities which cannot be provided from public sources, but which are, nevertheless, of much assistance in the veterinary care of sick animals. Moreover, when any requirement of an unusual nature is demanded from official sources, there is unavoidably a delay, and often much delay, in obtaining it. This is because financial sanction for special purchase must be obtained, a sanction which quite rightly is only given after more or less argument. A charitable society, on the other hand, is less bound with the necessities of red-tape and can meet a reasonable request without delay, if it is clear that prompt action will alleviate animal suffering; this work, in close co-operation with the responsible army authorities, insured promptness without waste of money or a duplication of work.

The Society, while recognizing the magnificent work done by the R.A.V.C., and the great privilege of being permitted to help, may justly take some credit for assisting that Corps to treat successfully, in France alone, 725,216 animals, of which 529,064 were cured, while of the remainder 29,524 were sold to local farmers, and 19,912 remained under treatment at the end of hostilities. Official statistics show that the wastage of horses in the South African campaign exceeded 55 per cent., but in the Great War, with many times the number of animals used, the wastage was only 25 per cent.

We do not think it is too much to claim that the continued success of the Society and its growing prestige since the Armistice, is certainly partly due to the fact that so many people who had either directly or indirectly come into contact with the Society's

work for the army horses, have come to realize that its aim has always been, while preventing cruelty, to help in a friendly and practical way those in charge of animals.

We cannot but feel that the experience gained during the Great War, and the military value and financial success of this co-operation of the Society with the army authorities, will have a lasting effect and that the animals utilized in future wars will receive the care and attention which is certainly their due. The following letter, addressed by Field-Marshal Sir Douglas Haig (now Earl Haig) to the Duke of Portland, chairman of the R.S.P.C.A. Fund for Sick and Wounded Horses, shows how much the work of the fund was appreciated.

“GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
January 28, 1919.

“SIR,

“I desire to express through you and your committee my sense of gratitude to all those who, in their sympathy for the welfare and comfort of the sick and wounded animals, have contributed to the special fund which was organized under the auspices of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and approved of by the Army Council as an auxiliary aid to the Army Veterinary Service.

“As you are aware, animals have been exposed to very severe trials and hardships, and have suffered heavily, not only as battle casualties, but through the exhaustion and loss of health consequent on the severe stress of work. Their lot has, however, been greatly lightened, and their comfort in sickness materially added to, by the assistance the fund has

been able to give. This fact will, I know, be gratifying to all donors of the fund.

"I attach a list of the chief objects on which the money subscribed has been devoted. I would specially like to express my thanks for the provision of motor horse ambulances, which have salved so many animals and proved indispensable adjuncts to Veterinary Service, also of the veterinary hospitals complete with every known convenience for up-to-date surgical and medical treatment.

"May I offer you my congratulations and express my appreciation of the work which has been achieved by your committee and helpers.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"(Signed) D. HAIG, Field-Marshal,

*"Commander-in-Chief,
British Armies in France."*

It was also a high privilege to be able to help the Australian and Canadian Contingents. Through the generosity of the Australian Purple Cross, which fund had first directly financed the work in connection with the Australian Force in the East, and subsequently through the R.S.P.C.A. fund, the Council helped in building a veterinary hospital and supplying veterinary requisites for the Australian Force in France. The R.S.P.C.A. fund was able also to build a special Canadian Veterinary Hospital for 2,500 animals, and equip it completely with motor ambulance, operating theatre, messes for officers and men, etc., besides helping in many other ways the Canadian Army Veterinary Corps. The following letter was received from the Director of Canadian Veterinary Services :

"July 8, 1919.

"DEAR SIR,

"Let me extend to you, on behalf of the Canadian Army Veterinary Corps, the appreciation of the services rendered to it by your Society during the war.

"Every request made has been gratefully responded to. This fact is highly appreciated by each and every officer of the Corps, who are carrying back with them to Canada pleasing memories of your helpful association.

"I feel that the results of your work will be felt throughout the world in the future to a far greater extent than was the case at the opening of hostilities, and that the life of our dumb friends will be much more pleasant than in the past.

"Yours very sincerely,

"(Signed) S. L. EDGETT, Colonel,

"*Director of Veterinary Services.*"

But the work of the Society on behalf of the animals employed in the war did not end with the signing of the Armistice.

The returning soldiers who wished to bring home with them the dogs who had been their companions in the trenches found themselves up against a problem—that of expense. There had been an outbreak of rabies in this country, due, it was believed, to the importation of a dog from abroad by aeroplane, and the Ministry of Agriculture had accordingly increased the quarantine period for imported dogs from four to six months.

Many British soldiers—officers and privates—found themselves utterly unable to pay the quarantine fees,

which amounted to about £14 a dog. What was to be done? Very naturally, any soldier who had had a dog companion with him in the trenches, a companion who had been over the top with him, had possibly been wounded with him and cured with him, wanted to bring that companion home. Some of these dogs were the men's own property, and had gone out with them from England; others had been "acquired." Homeless dogs of the ruined and depopulated villages had found their way into the British lines and into British hearts; the dogs had been adopted. Was it right, was it fair, that at the conclusion of hostilities dogs and masters should be separated?

The Council of the R.S.P.C.A. gave much thought to this matter. The Council reflected that if our soldiers had been paid at the same rate as the munition workers they would be in a position to pay for the quarantine fees for their dogs. Finally, the Council, confident of receiving the support of the British public, undertook, with the full approval of the Army Council, to be responsible for the quarantine expenses of the soldiers' dogs.

This was no small undertaking, because of the necessity for building special kennels. The quarantine accommodation under normal conditions is restricted, and the conditions were not normal. The Society, however, undertook to build 500 special kennels, and these, by arrangement with the Dogs' Home, Battersea, were put up at Hackbridge, the quarantine station of the Home.

Special arrangements were made with the authorities in regard to the necessary licences. Soldiers were asked to apply for licences to their commanding

officers, who made careful inquiries into the genuineness of each case. The offer of the Society was conditional on the humane destruction of all dogs that could not be brought back, and the authorities issued definite instructions on that point.

To ensure that each dog would be claimed at the end of the quarantine period, each owner was asked to pay £2 towards the expenses; the Society made itself responsible for the remainder, and no one came forward to suggest that in doing this the Society was exceeding its duty.

The *Daily Mail*, in a leading article on the soldiers' dogs, said :

"The best way to prevent dog-smuggling is to give soldier-owners of dogs an assurance that their dogs may rejoin them at home after the necessary six months' quarantine. The private soldier cannot afford the fees and keep of his dog which the six months involve. We welcome, therefore, the humane offer of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals to be responsible for the expense of quarantining the soldier's dog at their own special kennels."

It will be seen that the Society's offer was as important for the safety and welfare of the animals at home as it was for the dogs which were to be brought over to this country. The men, of course, were enthusiastically grateful to the Society for enabling them to bring their dogs home. Here are extracts from some of their letters :

From a corporal, Royal Engineers : "My dog is of no known breed, yet his intelligence exceeds that of many human beings I have met. He has been my companion and the companion of our little section

through many terrible times. We cannot discard him in the day of peace."

From a corporal, R.G.A.: "I found him in a dug-out on the old Somme battlefield, half-starved, and since then he has shared my meals and also my blankets at night. He is such a faithful companion and guard that I cannot think of leaving him behind when I return to Blighty."

From a private, 1/17th London Regt.: "He has been a faithful animal to me both in holding the line and attacking. I have had him about twelve months, and he was with me all through the retirement of 1918, and with me all through the late attacks since August, 1918. He has been slightly wounded twice in going over the top with me, but he has been inoculated by a friend in the R.A.M.C. each time. Kindly do your best for me, as I think he deserves to come with me, as he has stuck to me through thick and thin, and when I was wounded and could not walk he stayed with me all through the attack under a heavy barrage for nearly three hours, so you can understand how attached I am to him. . . ."

From a private, No. 2 Advanced Section, A.P. and S.S.: "I have a little fox terrier. He came to our unit as a puppy and is now about three years old. In all our movements, extending from time to time practically all over the Western Front, he has always been with us, standing side by side in times of danger. Apart from being such a companion, he has proved his worth over and over again, for in most of our moves we have had the company of rats, etc. This little fellow has killed some hundreds. Many nights we would have gone without sleep at all, only for his guard, which has been a boon to all."

Some of the dogs had seen service, having been employed as messengers. During heavy barrages, when all other communications had been cut, the messenger dogs had made their way. They "carried on" through darkness, mist, rain, and shell-fire, and over every sort of difficult ground. Many a time a dog brought a message in a few minutes over ground that would have taken a runner hours to cross. Could such dogs have been left behind, with a bullet apiece as their reward for services faithfully rendered?

Strict precautions were taken to prevent the importation of any dog suffering from disease. The soldiers' dogs were first taken to a veterinary hospital set apart for the purpose near Boulogne. Each dog was examined by a veterinary surgeon on its arrival, and on each day during its stay in the hospital. All dogs were kept in this hospital for at least five days before being sent over to this country, and during this time the dogs received every attention. Each batch of dogs was taken across by a sergeant and a number of men of the R.A.V.C. On landing at Southampton, they were met by an inspector of the Society and were taken straight to the Society's quarantine kennels at Hackbridge, where the dogs were again medically examined by a veterinary surgeon before commencing their six months' quarantine. The dogs were of various breeds, and not all of them were thoroughbreds; some were battle-scarred veterans. The Alsatian wolfdogs were evidently very popular with the men.

Happily, the appeal of the Society for assistance in this work met with a fair response from the public, but the expenses exceeded the receipts. The *Evening News* kindly arranged a sale of the original cartoons of their famous caricaturist, "Poy," for the benefit of

the Soldiers' Dog Fund, and gave the entire proceeds of the sale—£310 2s. 6d.

The most wonderful of all the war dogs was "Prince," an Irish terrier, who found his way from Hammersmith to the trenches. His story was a little too wonderful for some people, and they refused at first to believe it. The Society took pains to verify the facts, and we give the story here because it is probably the most extraordinary dog story of all time.

In September, 1914, James Brown went to France with the North Staffordshire Regiment, leaving behind him in Buttevant, Ireland, his wife and his Irish terrier, "Prince." The dog and his master were very much attached, and for some days after his master's departure, "Prince" moped and refused to be comforted. Shortly afterwards, Mrs. Brown visited her husband's home at Stafford, taking the dog with her, and after a stay of a few weeks took "Prince" to her home at Hammersmith.

About a month after coming to London, "Prince" was nowhere to be found, and a search proved unavailing. Mrs. Brown wrote informing her husband of the loss of his pet, and a few days later wrote again. To her amazement, she received a reply to her second letter explaining that "Prince" was safe with his master in France.

The details of his extraordinary journey are to this day a mystery, but the facts available show that he arrived suddenly at Armentières, apparently from nowhere, and greeted his master with the greatest display of affection, as though he had sought him out and was overjoyed at having achieved his object. The news spread like wildfire throughout the regiment, and next morning Private Brown had to parade with his pet



"PRINCE," THE DOG THAT FOUND ITS WAY FROM
HAMMERSMITH TO THE TRENCHES NEAR
ARMENTIÈRES.

From the picture by Mrs. G. Shaw-Baker.



MESSENGER DOG USED DURING THE WAR.
Note message case on collar. This was one of the
600 dogs guaranteed by the Society.

To face 4, 202

before the commanding officer, in order that the latter might believe his own eyes. The Society eventually brought “ Prince ” safely back to this country. The dog’s “ good angel,” who had guided and protected him during his memorable journey from Hammer-smith to France was less attentive after “ Prince ” was safely home again. On one sad day in 1921, “ Prince ” went out into the street and picked up a piece of poisoned meat. He was taken ill, and, in spite of every attention, never recovered.

All the Society’s plans for bringing over the soldiers’ dogs were carried out without a hitch, and when the kennels were no longer required they were handed over to the Dogs’ Home, Battersea.

In conclusion, it is only right to explain the disposal of the balance standing to the credit of the R.S.P.C.A. Sick and Wounded Horses Fund at the end of 1918, all of which was subscribed, of course, before it was possible to anticipate the signing of the Armistice. The Society, unfortunately, started the R.S.P.C.A. Soldiers’ Dog Fund just at the time when the country was threatened with an outbreak of rabies, and therefore the fund did not receive the support from the public which otherwise, no doubt, would have been forthcoming. An application was therefore made to the Charity Commissioners (the superior authority under the War Charities Act of 1916, under which both funds were registered) for permission to utilize a portion of the balance of the Sick and Wounded Horses Fund, and directions were given by the Commissioners for £15,000 to be transferred to the Soldiers’ Dog Fund, while £10,000 was ordered to be invested as a nucleus fund, with interim interest to the R.S.P.C.A., for resuming the functions of the

Horse Fund in the event of a future war. This ruling was carried out.

When the Soldiers' Dog Fund was closed, there was a balance in hand of £5,303 11s. 10d. This, by direction of the Charity Commissioners, was transferred back again to the nucleus of the Sick and Wounded Horses Fund, for the resuscitation of that fund in the unhappy event of a future war.

CHAPTER XIV

THE GROWTH OF THE WORK IN OTHER COUNTRIES

A GLANCE at the annual report of the R.S.P.C.A. shows how far-reaching has been the influence of the work for animals which, starting in a small way at what may well be regarded as an historic meeting in 1824, has now extended to all parts of the globe. This is surely a tribute to the British race, and bears eloquent testimony to its civilizing influence.

One of the first actions of a British authority when taking over a new country or colony is to adapt home institutions for growth in fresh soil, and one is proud to acknowledge this.

When, for instance, in the Great War the British troops took Baghdad, one of the first acts of the Military Governor was the formation of a society to protect the animals, and he at once applied to the R.S.P.C.A. for aid and advice.

It is not possible in the space at our disposal, nor does it really come within the scope of this history, to do more than refer to the work in other countries, but it is comforting to those who care for the cause to know that there are now societies for the protection of animals in all the European countries, in many of the Asiatic countries, and, as would be expected, in all parts of the world where British settlers have found a home. America has made splendid advances in our cause, and is, in certain respects, as will be

shown later, doing a great deal which has not yet been undertaken by the parent Society.

Naturally, too, Canada, in spite of many difficulties, has taken up the work with enthusiasm and success. In Montreal the Canadian S.P.C.A., started in 1869, continues to carry out most useful work, both preventive and educational, which has had far-reaching effects.

The Toronto S.P.C.A. was organized in 1873 under the title of the "Ontario S.P.C.A.," with the object, as stated at the time, "of protecting helpless animals from the cruelty of man and men themselves from the brutalizing effect which such cruelty begets." Unfortunately, after doing much useful work for a few years, the Society ceased to exist from lack of public support, and it was not until 1887 that it was reformed by Mr. J. J. Kelso. It now carries out the humane intentions of its founder with ever-growing success.

In 1882, in Ottawa, the Metropolitan S.P.C.A. was started, and six years later the Ottawa Humane Society took over the work, which it has continued with increasing good results. In all parts of Canada we find that the cause is finding fresh adherents, and as that wonderful country develops one can only hope that, in the future, those who leave our shores for a new home will remember that kindness to animals has become a racial characteristic of the British, and will assist those residents who are protecting animals in spite of many difficulties which are unknown to us in England.

Africa, too, has its workers for the animals. As long ago as 1872 the Cape of Good Hope S.P.C.A. was founded with a membership of thirty-eight—a total

which has since grown to 875; the Society has a staff of four inspectors to cover the very large area of its operations. Durban, Pietermaritzburg, Bulawayo, and Pretoria have also centres for animal protection, and so, under difficulties which are peculiar to the country, this excellent work is carried on with the active support of the Government authorities.

The same story of steady progress, in spite of many difficulties and, in some cases, of little enthusiasm from many who should be among the first to support the good cause, might be told of the societies in Australia, India, Burma, Ceylon, Egypt, China, Japan, and Palestine, to name no more.

The Calcutta Society was founded by Mr. Colesworthy Grant in 1861, and was the first society of its kind to be established in Asia. It had the support of Lord Elgin, then Viceroy of India, and in the first year it obtained 506 convictions. It was founded, after consultation with the R.S.P.C.A., to end "the barbarous and wanton acts of cruelty towards the lower animals daily seen in the streets of Calcutta, which have greatly impressed some of the leading members of the European and Indian community." It was followed twelve years later by the formation of a Society in Bombay. The youngest but by no means the least successful of the animal protection societies in India is the Darjeeling Himalayan S.P.C.A., founded in 1906 by Mrs. H. M. Lennox, who, as its honorary secretary, worked indefatigably for many years not only to prevent the actual existing cruelties, but also to insure the successful continuation of this work by educational methods and by providing hospital treatment for animals, drinking troughs, pack-pony halts, etc.

As can well be expected from the huge and progressive country of America the cause of animal protection has spread and flourished there. Enthusiasm, backed up by increasing and deserved financial support, has enabled its workers to overcome indifference and the opposition of vested interests until, at the present time, the cause has become thoroughly established in the daily life of America.

We are indebted to Mr. Richard C. Craven, of the American Humane Association, for the following account of animal protection work in the United States :

Organized animal protection in the United States had its inception fifty-eight years ago in New York City, where Henry Bergh founded the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Henry Bergh became the Society's first president, and retained that office until his death in 1888. During the twenty-two years of his presidency he built up an organization remarkable for its strength and efficiency, characteristics which the Society possesses to a great degree to-day.

Henry Bergh was a man whose personality embodied a large measure of sensitiveness and altruism. He was a man with soul, endowed with a strong sense of justice, especially towards the weak and helpless, and was of the type that destined him to occupy a place among the world's reformers.

In his early years Mr. Bergh developed an inclination for diplomatic service, and in 1862 he went to St. Petersburg as secretary of the American Legation. In that city his heart was moved by the terrible sufferings of dumb animals, and he frequently interfered to protect them. On his way back to America

Mr. Bergh made the acquaintance of John Colam, secretary of the R.S.P.C.A., became interested in the work of animal protection, and resolved to organize a movement in his own country. No man ever faced more strenuous opposition than did Henry Bergh when he attempted in New York City to give definite shape to his plans. He, like Martin, was ridiculed in the Press and was a jest for the cartoonists. Little had ever been heard before of the rights of animals, the general attitude being that a man could do as he wished with his own property. Bergh, however, secured as allies some of the most influential people in New York, and at the memorable public meeting in Clinton Hall, February 8, 1866, he presented his case with such convincing appeal that a preliminary organization was formed. Two months later, April 10, the Society was incorporated, and on April 19 the Legislature of New York State passed the first law for the protection of animals ever enacted on the continent. This first law was in general terms, and was as follows :

“Every person who shall, by his act or neglect, maliciously kill, maim, wound, injure, torture, or cruelly beat any horse, mule, cow, cattle, sheep, or other animal, belonging to himself or another, shall, upon conviction, be adjudged guilty of a misdemeanor.”

This original statute was so carefully drawn by Henry Bergh, and so comprehensive in its terms, that it has been adopted by every State in the Union, and in Canada, in almost the identical words of its originator. It has stood the test of years, and is to-day the statute under which most prosecutions for cruelty are brought before the courts.

Animal conditions at the time when the Society was founded, not only in New York, but throughout the country, would be beyond comprehension to those living under twentieth-century standards. Henry Bergh realized that only vigorous application of law could change those conditions, and he proceeded to put the law into effect. His first prosecution was that of a butcher who bound the legs of a number of calves, and threw them one on top of another into a cart, which was so filled that many of the calves were suffocated. Another early prosecution involved two horses unable to draw a heavy load of stone. The driver obtained a quantity of straw, placed it under the horses and set fire to it, with results too horrible for description. Bergh also stopped the practice of plucking live fowl, and the plunging of the live birds into boiling water under the pretence of its being an easier mode of removing the feathers. He was frequently in conflict with the street railway companies, whose horses were treated atrociously. It was not uncommon for horses to fall in the streets from the exhaustion of hauling the overcrowded street cars. Bergh relentlessly fought the debased sporting fraternity whose inhuman tastes found satisfaction in the promotion of dog-fights, cock-fights, and other brutalities. He and his officers raided and finally closed the notorious Sportsmen's Hall, where cruel sports took place frequently. This place was patronized by men holding responsible offices, and was regarded as one of the sights of New York by visitors of depraved instincts from England and other countries.

To-day there is no city in the world where an animal is more thoroughly protected than in New

York. The Society, which was founded by Henry Bergh, has earned public respect because of the unflinching manner in which it has enforced the law. It has never been a respecter of persons, has never pandered to position, wealth or influence. Many philanthropists of ample means have contributed to its endowment. It employs more than a hundred people, and has ample equipment. It owns magnificent headquarters at the corner of Madison Avenue and Twenty-sixth Street, has a splendid hospital and shelter for animals on Avenue A, branch headquarters with accommodation for staff, animals and equipment at 233, Butler Street, Brooklyn, shelter, garage, and general offices at the Bronx, and a fine building at Staten Island. It owns and operates ambulances for large and small animals, and has a fleet of automobiles for the use of the officers.

During the last few years this Society, through a special department, has promoted humane education in the city schools with astonishing results. In this work the main purpose has been to train the juvenile character to a better recognition of what is due to the animal kingdom, and at the same time to make better citizens of those who are now of school age. During the summer months the Society maintains seven receiving stations for animals in the public parks. In the schools the children are urged to take sick, injured, homeless, and unwanted animals to these receiving stations, and during 1923 the number of dogs and cats delivered to the seven stations reached the remarkable total of 27,281. This is one of the practical results of humane education.

The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is doing an enormous work. It receives,

collects, and disposes of approximately a thousand small animals a day. By special act of Legislature it handles the entire duties of issuing dog licences, collecting the fees, seizing unlicensed animals, and picking up the stray and homeless. Its record in dealing with small animals was set a few years ago when in a single month the Society at its various establishments dealt with more than 96,000 dogs and cats. The Society is ably directed by Mr. W. K. Horton, who has been manager since 1906.

In considering the achievements of this Society credit must be given to Henry Bergh for his connection with the founding of the world's first society for the prevention of cruelty to children. Bergh prosecuted a woman for brutal treatment of a child after charitable societies had declared their helplessness in the matter, and following the hearing of this famous case there was formed the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. In the United States to-day a majority of the anti-cruelty societies undertake the combined work of the protection of children and animals under the general title of humane societies. One advantage claimed for this system is that in the smaller cities, by combining the two branches, it is possible to employ an officer of a higher type than could be maintained if the societies confined themselves exclusively to the protection of children or animals.

From New York the cause of animal protection spread to other cities. In Philadelphia Mrs. Caroline Earle White and Colonel Richard Muckle started a splendid work. In Boston George Thorndike Angell founded the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. This came about in 1866 as

the result of a horse race over the roads of the State in which two horses were driven to death. Mr. Angell wrote a letter to the Boston newspapers denouncing the affair, and soon afterwards the Massachusetts Society was formed with Mr. Angell as President, a position he held until his death in 1909. Soon after this Society was formed Mr. Angell brought out the monthly magazine *Our Dumb Animals*. The first issue was 200,000 copies, and Mr. Angell secured the assistance of officers of the Boston Police Force in placing a copy in every home in Boston. Since that time the magazine has been published monthly without intermission. Mr. Angell's greatest work was done in the cause of humane education. He lectured in scores of cities, before all kinds of audiences, and formed many new societies in all parts of the country. He organized the Band of Mercy movement in America, and the American Humane Education Society. To-day more than twenty States have laws making humane education a compulsory part of the school curriculum. Since the death of Mr. Angell the Massachusetts Society has been further developed under the presidency of Dr. Francis H. Rowley. A magnificent hospital—probably the finest animal hospital in the world—has been erected in Boston and is known as the Angell Memorial Animal Hospital. The Society also operates a rest farm near Boston, where horses requiring rest or recuperation are taken and given care and treatment.

In the early days of the movement societies were established in the important centres, such as Chicago, Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Cincinnati, St. Louis, San Francisco, New Orleans, Denver, Pittsburg, Omaha, Milwaukee, Detroit, and many others.

Milwaukee is the only city in the country which has erected a statue to the memory of Henry Bergh. Some of the societies in the United States have jurisdiction only in the city in which they are located, many operate over an entire county, and a few have state-wide jurisdiction. In general it has been found that the county or city is the most practical unit for successful operation. It would be impossible to succeed with one great national organization controlling or directing local units, not only on account of the enormous territory to be covered, but also very largely because each one of the forty-eight States in the Union makes its own laws, and as a consequence there is a vast difference in the laws, even of adjoining States. In all there are about five hundred individual organizations scattered throughout the country, each one being independent and self-governing. Not all of them are entirely efficient; in some localities the work has failed to appeal to popular imagination. At the present time, however, there is a revival of sympathy for the cause in a number of cities. The Legislature of Wisconsin, for example, realizing the importance of child and animal protection, voted the necessary funds and appointed a State humane officer whose duties are to promote humane work, guide and assist existing societies, form additional ones, and to aid in enforcing the anti-cruelty law. Under Colonel A. E. Frederick, who received the appointment, the departure has proved helpful in building up the cause in that State.

Most of the larger organizations own a headquarters building, with offices, ambulances, and animal shelter; in fact, some such building is indispensable if a successful society is to exist under

the conditions obtaining in American cities. In many instances the work is aided by grants from public funds. Usually these grants take the form of payment for services rendered, as in cases where the society enforces the dog licence law, and employs men to collect unlicensed animals and care for them until the licence fees are paid or the dogs are disposed of. It has been found that a society for the protection of animals is able to do this work more humanely and with greater satisfaction to the public than a department under the control of a city administration. Some idea of the extent of this service may be gained from the fact that many societies give care and shelter to more than ten thousand animals in the course of a year. The Animal Rescue League of Boston* cares for approximately fifty thousand annually. Many of these must be destroyed, as the total includes a large proportion of undesirables. Some societies also employ a veterinarian, who gives advice as to the treatment of animals, and gives his professional services for the benefit of the animals of the poor.

A movement of such proportions naturally turned towards federation. There must be a national voice to be heard on subjects of national importance and scope. In 1877 the societies federated under the title of the American Humane Association. Since that time a conference has been held annually. The American Humane Association was founded originally for the purpose of dealing with the evils and abuses connected with the transportation of live-stock

* Founded in 1899 by Mrs. Huntington Smith. The League has also a Home of Rest and Animals' Cemetery at Pine Ridge. The League does most useful and practical preventive work.

from the farms to the great packing house centres. It was a problem too vast for any individual society. Conditions were frightful. Food animals were kept in the cattle trucks for as long as four, five, or six days without food or water and without being released for rest. They were shockingly overcrowded. Thousands died on the long journeys; thousands more were crippled, mainly through being trampled on by their fellows. In winter, when the temperature was often below zero and terrible blizzards swept the plains, whole trucks of cattle froze to death. To-day, under Federal law, cattle in transportation must be unloaded for food, water, and rest every twenty-eight hours. This was one victory secured by the humane forces. To-day live-stock interests are working with the American Humane Association in an endeavour to reduce transportation losses to a minimum, and also to reduce the loss from bruising and crippling.

Gradually the American Humane Association has grown to a position of importance and responsibility. In 1905 Dr. William O. Stillman, of Albany, New York, who had been so successful as administrative officer of the Mohawk and Hudson River Humane Society, became President, a position he has held continuously ever since and holds to-day.* Under him the Association has flourished and expanded. It includes societies for the protection of children, as well as societies for the protection of animals. It employs a considerable staff, publishes a monthly magazine, the *National Humane Review*, which has a world-wide influence, a large quantity of miscel-

* With sincere sorrow and regret we have to record the death of Dr. Stillman on March 15, 1924.

laneous literature, and is the rallying ground of most of the American societies. It aids them in their difficulties, sends out organizers and lecturers to help them and forms new societies where they are required. It strives, under all circumstances, to build up the local units rather than seek to become all-powerful.

During the world war Dr. Stillman founded the American Red Star Animal Relief for the purpose of aiding army animals in much the same manner as the Red Cross operates on behalf of humans. A large sum of money was raised and expended in the purchase of ambulances and veterinary supplies. Since the war the Red Star has been retained for the purpose of meeting emergencies of national scope. It is impossible to detail the wonderful work which has been carried on through Dr. Stillman's efforts for the benefit of child and animal protection in the United States, or to refer, except thus briefly, to the amount of aid and encouragement which his Association has been able to give to many S.P.C.A.s throughout the world.

Among the national problems with which the Red Star is dealing is the evil that concerns the losses and suffering of live-stock on the great ranges. The death losses of cattle and sheep from starvation and exposure amount, approximately, to 1,800,000 annually. The losses occur chiefly on the public domain—lands which have never been settled and which are for the most part too barren for general agriculture. Vast herds of cattle now roam over these ranges, once inhabited only by buffalo. In winter they die in large numbers, especially in winters when the snow is so heavy as to cover up all the forage. The Red Star is pressing the Government to regulate the use of these

public lands, and urging the stockowners to raise food to take care of their animals in winter. The campaign is meeting with some success, but old customs die hard. Losses are still heavy, and occasionally reports are received of whole herds having been wiped out owing to lack of food.

The anti-cruelty movement in the United States is growing in strength and influence. There is a gradual tendency to substitute methods of education in place of prosecution, and to give aid to the animals requiring it in all circumstances.

CHAPTER XV

SOME REFORMS STILL IN THE MAKING

ANYONE who has read the foregoing chapters, or who has even only a sketchy idea of the history of modern civilization, will realize that many successful reforms have been brought about through the agency of the R.S.P.C.A. But yet, though much has been done, an enormous amount of work is still uncompleted—much of it because it concerns or would interfere with accepted customs, financial profits, or vested interests. Truly was it said of the nation as a whole, “They are a nation of shopkeepers,” and because of that certain cruelties, which are recognized as inexcusable by a large public opinion, are still allowed because “you must not interfere with trade!” And probably that accounts for the fact that the horse, of all other animals, perhaps, has been the most exploited and ill-used. It has become almost an axiom not to trust even a friend over a horse! Until the advent of railways, followed later by motors, civilization, travel, and trade depended largely on the labour of the horse, and so he has been much abused, publicly and privately. When railroads were first made it was suggested that horses would no longer be required and that the work of the Society would decrease. When motor-cars were introduced the same cry was raised, but with each change the necessity for protecting horses has really increased, since they have, as it were, fallen from their high estate and are now

looked upon by the majority as a cheaper, and therefore an inferior, form of traction.

The price of a horse is less than that of a motor-car, and his driving needs less skill and knowledge; therefore, even though the wretched animal is worked to death, his work will earn the cost of his successor! In this way his treatment has become, in many cases, worse, and it is perhaps more difficult nowadays to detect cases of cruelty, as fewer horses are working on the high-roads. The cases of cruelty are to be found in fields and on by-roads, and they must be dealt with!

In these days it would be impossible for anyone to ride a horse to death as was done in 1835 when a man set out on horseback to take the news after the Derby to the *Sun* newspaper. He thrashed and spurred the animal unmercifully, and when it reached Waterloo Bridge it staggered and fell; the horse lay on the ground for an hour and forty minutes and died that same evening. The Society prosecuted, and in fining the rider £5 the magistrate said that such cruelty was not to be tolerated in the heart of the Metropolis merely because people were to be informed at a particular time of the result of a horse-race. Magistrates, however, differed then, as now, in their views as to cruelty, for in another race against time, as a result of which the horse died in excruciating agony, the magistrates said they did not think the case was sufficiently atrocious, and inflicted only a small fine.

Another prosecution by the Society for a similar offence (where the culprit was fined £5 and costs for riding a horse, as a result of a wager, from a certain town to London, a distance of nearly one hundred miles in eleven and three-quarter hours) had a curious

sequel. The culprit realized the cruelty of his action, as a result of which the animal died, and insisted on fining himself £50 on condition that £45 went to the Society in testimony of regret for the offence!

Cases such as these belong to the past, and so also does the cruel and absurd practice of burning a horse's mouth for "lampas." But many years ago it was the common practice of horse-owners, farmers, and others to fire the bars of a horse's mouth with a hot iron as a certain cure for this so-called disease, and it was only put a stop to by the Society's prosecutions.

While in some aspects the lives of horses have been improved, in others the conditions under which they live and work have brought fresh hardships which, if unchecked, undoubtedly lead to cruelty and unnecessary suffering. The advent of motor traction has certainly done something to improve the lot of a horse as a draught animal, but owing to the slipperiness of present-day road surfaces to ensure smooth running for motor-cars, the high roads have become a constant source of danger and over-straining for the luckless animals who are still employed on them for draught purposes.

The Society, in conjunction with the Roads Improvement Association, therefore instituted, in 1913, a worldwide competition for a suitable non-slip horse-shoe. About eight hundred and fifty entries were received, but, unfortunately, no shoe or device was of sufficient merit to warrant the committee awarding the prize of £100 offered by the R.S.P.C.A. The judges, however, granted premiums to two entrants, and these shoes have met with a certain amount of success.

At one time, however, the high-roads were much too rough. It was the custom, when making or repairing roads, to throw down angular pieces of granite to the depth of four or five inches and to leave them for horses and carriages and carts to grind them into the ground. The Society succeeded in persuading the road authorities of London to use steam rollers—a custom which was soon followed in country districts—and thus injury to horses' feet caused by the sharp pieces of granite was prevented.

The days of the old horse omnibuses are over, but many people now living will remember the strain that was put on the horses by the continual stopping and starting. At one time not a single omnibus in London had a brake. The Society, in the interests of the horses, suggested this obvious improvement, but the omnibus companies laughed at the idea and put every possible kind of opposition in its way. Eventually the Society caused brakes to be applied to three different omnibuses, and they answered so admirably that brakeless omnibuses went out of fashion.

To come to more modern times, certain acts of cruelty to horses ceased when funeral plumes were abolished. A plume weighed about six pounds, and in wet and windy weather the wearing of these plumes caused discomfort and in many cases actual suffering to the horses. The views of the Society on this matter were placed before the Undertakers' Association, and the council of that Association cordially agreed with the Society that the use of the plumes was unnecessary and to be deprecated. The Society then circularized all the undertakers in the Kingdom asking them to discontinue the use of plumes at funerals, and to the credit of the undertakers it may be said that



ONE OF THE VICTIMS OF THE WORN-OUT HORSE
TRAFFIC.

An English horse, suffering from bad laminitis, arriving at Rotterdam for slaughter.



A FUNERAL PLUME.

the Society did not receive a single refusal to comply with the request. Funeral plumes on horses were thus abolished ten years ago.

As will be seen from the foregoing, the Society's propaganda has often been crowned with success, either as a result of continued prosecution or because of the co-operation of those in authority. And so the Society is encouraged, even when faced with the constant opposition of trade interests, to continue its agitation against certain systematic abuses which still exist and which demand speedy reform. Reference has already been made in another chapter to the continued and unnecessary suffering to which animals in slaughter-houses are still subjected. The results of the Society's campaign in this direction are certainly encouraging and inspire a hope that, within a short time, the opposition and prejudice of the trade will be overcome. But there are, unfortunately, other reforms which have also tarried too long and which require special legislation. The export of horses for butchery purposes (formerly known as "the worn-out horse traffic"), the use of horses and ponies in mines, and the employment of trained animals as stage performers for public amusement are customs which must be abolished.

The problem of "the worn-out horse traffic" with the Continent has occupied the Society's attention for many years, and the Society has had to fight continually against a reluctance to interfere with this unsavoury trade, particularly since the R.S.P.C.A. has been accused of interfering thereby with the legitimate trade of horse-breeding and horse-selling. This traffic in worn-out horses, which began about twenty-five years ago, was first encouraged by the

scarcity of meat in Holland and Belgium, and the imperative necessity for the poorer classes to have cheap animal food. And so a market was created for the live horse which had become unfit, through disease, overwork, or age, from further work in this country. Owners, for a few extra pounds or even shillings, sold these animals to be shipped abroad without examination as to fitness even to travel, and well knowing that the fate of these animals was too hideous even to contemplate. Many of these poor creatures were so unfit that the dealers were afraid to travel them on the roads, and so smuggled them to the docks late at night or early in the morning. Against this horrible traffic, which had come to be known as "England's shame," the Society in 1895 commenced an active campaign. Special inspectors were employed on the roads leading to the ports, and others were sent in plain clothes to the Continental ports. Hundreds of convictions followed, but the trade was so lucrative that the fines did not deter the dealers from continuing this hideous business, and since the docks and vessels, being private property, were not open to the Society's inspectors, animals conveyed in floats could not be interfered with. While the Society, from the very commencement of this traffic, paid special attention to the trade, as far as its legal powers would allow to prevent unfit horses being travelled on the road, it naturally also endeavoured to obtain legislation to regulate the trade and ensure that the animals should be properly shipped, fed, and watered.

In 1898 a deputation from the Society attended at the House of Commons, and had a lengthy and important interview with Mr. Walter Long, M.P. (now

Lord Long of Wraxall), then President of the Board of Agriculture. It was pointed out by this deputation that the horses were too often neither fed nor watered while on board, that the accommodation on the ship was utterly unsuitable and inadequate, and that horses totally unfit to travel were being shipped abroad.

The President stated in reply that it was impossible to have an efficient system of inspection, seeing that horses could be embarked at any port of the Kingdom. It had evidently not occurred to the authorities that, as in the case of cattle, the ports could be limited. This possibility was pointed out to them, and as a result the Board issued an Exportation of Horses Order, 1898, which made it illegal to convey from any port in Great Britain any horse which, "owing to age, infirmity, illness, injury, fatigue, or any other reason, could not be conveyed without cruelty during the intended passage and on landing." The remedy was simple enough—so simple that the officials of the Board could not devise it themselves—and it would have been efficacious had the Order been carried out in the spirit of its inception, for, it will be noted, even then "cruelty on landing" had been provided for. But it remained practically a dead letter; unfit horses, instead of being rejected and slaughtered, were accepted at the various ports, were passed, and were sent to the Continental markets, with the result that the dealers continued to buy up and travel such poor creatures to the ports, and the R.S.P.C.A. had to prosecute in thousands of cases for travelling unfit horses to the docks. Had the Order, which recognized the possibilities of cruelty during the intended passage and *on landing*—an important point since the Ministry now hold that they cannot prevent cruelties

which are likely to occur after the animals have once been disembarked on a foreign shore—been properly carried out, we should, years ago, have put an end to what has rightly been called “England’s shame.”

In 1906 the R.S.P.C.A. sent a special representative to watch the arrival of British ships at Dutch and Belgian ports, and, among other evidence of mal-administration which involved untold suffering on our old horses, he noticed a class of veterinary students at Antwerp, specially sent to examine the English arrivals for the sake of practical demonstrations in the diseases of the horses! As a result of the evidence thus obtained, a deputation from the R.S.P.C.A. again visited the Board of Agriculture to urge the necessity of veterinary inspection. The deputation’s suggestions were once more declared to be impossible because the staff of the Board was not large enough to do the inspection or other detailed work at the ports of embarkation. When one remembers how easily Government office staffs were increased during and after the Great War such excuses seem laughable! As the Board could not see how the necessary provision of inspectors could be made it was again left to the R.S.P.C.A. to deal with the matter. And again it had to fight permanent officialdom, which first claimed that reform was unnecessary—for the Order of 1898 was all-sufficient—and then said that, bearing in mind that in one year 60,000 horses were exported, of which 35,000 were worth under £10 per head, “a large staff of veterinary surgeons would be necessary to carry out a proper inspection.” Fate certainly seemed against the horses and against the Society, for, after twice introducing a Bill to provide for such a staff of inspectors, Sir Howard Vincent,

M.P., died. The Bill was reintroduced in December, 1908, by Mr. (now Sir) George Greenwood, but, receiving no help from the Government, because the authorities could see no reason why the Order of 1898 should be strengthened, it had to be dropped.

Here we have the same *official* view of insurmountable difficulties which has, through each successive stage of this combat for the horses, crippled the Society's efforts. Yet the passing of Acts of Parliament can overcome most difficulties if the responsible department will give its support. It would surely have been possible for the Board, through its permanent secretary, to have introduced a measure giving it the power to appoint the necessary staff of inspectors, and to collect in fees the income required for their payment. The Department, through its President and secretary, acknowledged the existence of cruelties, just as the Department again acknowledged them by publishing in March, 1921, the White Paper, to which reference is made in a later part of this chapter; but then, as now, it maintained the traditional *non possumus* attitude, and it will again, one supposes, be left to charitable societies, aided by the public Press and public opinion, to find a remedy.

The *Daily Mail* published in 1909 an article from a special correspondent who had been sent to watch the arrival of the horses at Antwerp. He said: "I have sufficient faith in the humanity of my fellow-countrymen to feel that if they knew one-tenth of all I have seen and heard during my inquiry here with the fate of Great Britain's worn-out horses, there would be such an outcry that the piteous traffic would be put an end to within three months. I am tired of hearing

the words 'the shame of England,' but one feels they must be spoken again and again till the nation is aroused."

The thanks of all animal lovers are due to the *Daily Mail* for the great assistance given to the Society at that time.

Early in 1910 the *Daily Mail* correspondent accompanied the Society's secretary (Captain E. G. Fairholme) on his second visit to the Continental ports, and the publicity given by that paper aroused public indignation. By a curious coincidence these two observers arrived at Antwerp in time to watch the arrival of a ship from Hull with 157 horses on board. The ship had weathered a very bad storm, and the discharge of its cargo was a ghastly sight. Thirty horses had died and seventeen were so injured that their throats had to be cut on board immediately on arrival at the dock side. The ship had run into a storm when too far out at sea to seek shelter, and, of course, the excuse was that such "an act of Providence could not be guarded against." The loss entailed to the dealers by this ghastly business so infuriated them that when they saw Captain Fairholme photographing the heaped-up carcasses as a record to convince the authorities as to what not only might, but did actually happen with this winter traffic, they assaulted him, stole the camera, and threatened him and his companion. But useful results came from this action of the dealers, for the Belgian Prime Minister received these two observers and promised his personal help to improve conditions, and the public were at length aroused to the horrors of the traffic.

On March 9, 1910, Mr. George Greenwood, M.P.,

(ever ready in the cause of the animals), introduced another Bill into Parliament which finally became law in the following October and was known as the Diseases of Animals Act, 1910. It was originally drafted to prevent cruelty to the horses during the intended voyage and *after being disembarked*, and this would have done much to put an end to the traffic; but, unfortunately, the last three words were altered, and in the Act, as passed, the all-important provision "after being disembarked," which recognized the future fate of the wretched animal, was changed to read "capable of being conveyed to such a port and disembarked without cruelty." This alteration, which watered the Act and reduced its utility, was made by Parliament with the full knowledge of what might and did happen after disembarkation, and it was merely a shifting of responsibility to say that such suffering could not be prevented because it was inflicted in another country. What, one may ask, would be said of any civilized country which allowed the export of some of its inhabitants for slavery and torture in another country, fully realizing the conditions to which they were going, while claiming that they had no responsibility for what happened outside their own country? Yet that is what is being done, and has been done for many years, to those old horses which are either British-born or have worked out their lives in faithful service in Britain. The ships which take them to their fate are British, the owners and officers are British. The cruelty commences in Great Britain and continues under the British flag. Why? Because the Ministry of Agriculture, representing the farmers and breeders, fears to hamper a trade which apparently cannot

flourish except at the cost of suffering and cruelty which bring disgrace on the whole country. The National Farmers' Union, and, no doubt, all the horse-breeding societies, share the Ministry's view—or perhaps inspire that view—and humanitarians are blamed for daring to interfere with “a legitimate trade” which brings money into the country. This excuse has been made since the commencement of the trade, and it was met by Sir Howard Vincent, M.P. for Sheffield, and a member of the Society's council, who, as one of the deputation in 1898 already referred to, said :

“We can well understand the reluctance of a Government or a Legislature to adopt any measure in restraint of legitimate trade; but a trade which involves gross cruelty to dumb creatures, and to animals which have faithfully served their masters and the public so long as they are able, is not legitimate.”

While this Bill was before Parliament the R.S.P.C.A. sent a deputation to the Board of Agriculture to seek its support, and on that occasion the Secretary of the Board said :

“I do not hesitate to say that there is not a member of the staff of the Board who does not feel that a stigma of inhumanity and cruelty has rested on this country in regard to this traffic. The Board welcomes the assistance of the newspaper Press. It has strengthened the hands of this authority, and, I believe, as a consequence, in a few months we shall have no further cause to complain of this inhumanity.”

The President (Earl Carrington, now the Marquis of Lincolnshire) also said :

“I am fully alive to the disgusting character of the

traffic, and wish it could be abolished, but that is impossible."

It will be illuminating, and serve to show the difficulties against which the Society has had to fight, to place on record another example of the Governmental attitude, which is to block any reform while it can, and then, when public opinion "shows which way the wind is blowing," to welcome the change as one long desired. When the R.S.P.C.A., through Mr. George Greenwood, was striving to introduce a Bill to insure proper inspection, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board admitted "that representations have been made for many years past as to this trade," but "the Board have no power to stop the traffic or to require the slaughter of particular animals before embarkation." Later, however, when the Society's Bill was being considered by the Standing Committee of the House, he said:

"The Department welcomed the Bill which, they believed, would have the effect of stopping the dreadful cruelties of unfit horses being shipped."

That was in 1909, and yet in 1921 the Board—or rather the Ministry, to give it its present title—had once more to acknowledge that those cruelties still went on.

In connection with the agitation which resulted in the passing of the 1910 Act, in its unfortunately weakened form, it should be recorded that King Edward VII. and Queen Alexandra desired full information as to the cruelties, and they demonstrated their sympathy with the Society, of which Their Majesties were Patrons, and their desire to see these cruelties ended.

It is interesting here to note that this trade had

steadily increased in volume, and that while in 1904 24,198 horses of a value of £10 and under were exported, two years later the number had increased to 46,886 !

But in spite of the Act, or because the important words "after being disembarked" had been taken out of the drafted Bill, and in spite of inspection which had been regarded as the possible cure for this evil, the traffic continued and our horses were subjected to the cruelties inevitably connected with the shipment of live animals across the North Sea during winter months, and to the inhumane methods of slaughter on the Continent. The Act had caused a reduction in the traffic and a raising of the standard of the horses exported, but it was still necessary for the Society to prosecute dealers for travelling unfit horses with the chance that they would pass the inspection at the ports, and special inspectors had still to be employed to watch the approaches to the various docks. Fresh facts were collected, some from residents abroad who saw the weekly procession of England's old horses arriving at the Continental ports. The Society, mainly through the instrumentality of Miss A. F. M. Cole, whose name will always be honourably connected with the fight against the traffic, obtained a film showing the actual procession, and the ghastly killing in the up-country butchery establishments. Unfortunately, the film was too repulsive for general exhibition, but the Society exhibited it to the authorities and to Members of Parliament.

Once more the Board of Agriculture received a deputation from the Society with the object of securing a more strict enforcement of the inspection

by the Board's veterinary surgeons, but the deputation were assured again that "everything possible was being done and that the incidents of cruelty and suffering were only exceptional or caused by unexpected storms." Another Bill to prohibit the export of any live horse of a value of £10 or under was, therefore, introduced by Captain (now Colonel) the Hon. Arthur Murray, M.P., a member of the Society's council. Unfortunately, the Bill met with no success. It was reintroduced in February, 1914, by Colonel Hall Walker, M.P. (now Lord Wavertree), and, after being much weakened by amendment, was eventually passed.

This Bill, known as the Export of Horses Act, 1914, was, however, not put into force as, owing to the outbreak of the Great War, the export of all horses ceased, and traffic was not resumed until the autumn of 1919.

Once more the Society had reason to make strong protests to the Government. The Ministry of Agriculture issued a "Warning to Horse Dealers and Exporters," reminding them, in accordance with the Act, among other things, that no horses could be shipped to any European port unless they were examined by a veterinary officer of the Ministry immediately before shipment and were certified by him to be capable of being conveyed and disembarked without cruelty and to be capable of being worked without suffering.

This official warning came none too soon. Disquieting statements began to be made that unfit horses were being shipped, and these statements were in some cases borne out by authentic evidence, which was at once forwarded to the Ministry of Agriculture.

Explanations were given and assurances made that the system of inspection would be tightened up. The Society also communicated with M. Carton de Wiart, the Prime Minister of Belgium, and subsequently a Belgian Royal Decree ordered that all horses sent over ten miles from the port of their arrival should be forwarded by train. Some slight alleviation of the sufferings of the horses was thereby assured, but official regulations were powerless to stop the awful cruelty of slaughtering the horses by the most inhumane methods. The Society realized that the only way of stamping out that cruelty was to stop the export of live horses for butchery purposes.

With this object in view the Council of the Society urged the Government to put a tax of £15 (afterwards raised to £20) on every live horse exported from the country. This tax would have made the trade in butchery horses unprofitable, and it would have ceased. The Belgians and others could still have had their horse meat, because the animals could have been killed humanely on this side and the carcasses could have been exported.

To further this movement, Lord Lambourne, chairman of the R.S.P.C.A., addressed a request to the King of the Belgians inviting His Majesty's support of a recommendation made by the R.S.P.C.A. to the Belgian Prime Minister that his Government should appoint Belgian veterinary inspectors to examine and pass in this country the carcasses of horses intended for human food, so as to obviate the export of butchery horses alive. His Majesty, in acknowledging the request, stated that he had specially commended the view of the R.S.P.C.A. on the matter

to the careful attention of the Belgian Minister of Agriculture.

Lord Lambourne also headed a deputation to the Minister of Agriculture, and was once more assured by the Minister and his permanent officials that the cases of cruelty cited were exceptional and that the type of animals sent had greatly improved. But the agitation continued and at last the Minister (Sir Arthur Griffith-Boscawen, M.P.) sent one of his own veterinary inspectors to Belgium and Holland "to study the condition of horses arriving from the British ports and the ultimate destination of the horses." This inspector's report confirmed the allegations made and mentioned cases of palpably unfit horses which had been passed by other inspectors of the Ministry as fit to work. The official system of inspection was obviously faulty, and the Society renewed its protests; in doing this it was aided by the various humane societies and at a representative meeting of all of them it was decided to hold a mass meeting at the Albert Hall on May 21, 1921, to protest against the traffic. Lord Lambourne, who presided at this meeting, described the traffic as a "disgrace to Europe, a disgrace to England, a disgrace to everyone connected with it, and a disgrace to any Government that allowed it to go on."

Miss Cole, who has done so much to bring the horrors of the traffic to the notice of the public of this country, gave an account of her experiences when watching the traffic on the Continent.

"I wish," she said, "you could see those English horses stumbling up the gangways, standing in a

long line tied to the railings on the bleak dock road. Of course, they have no covering; often there is a bitter wind, and sometimes snow and sleet. You can see them walking in a dismal procession, tied three abreast, four and a half miles through Antwerp. If any cannot walk they are conveyed in the float at the end of the procession. If a horse falls in the float and cannot get up, the float is backed against the door of the slaughter-house and the chains used to hoist the carcasses are fastened to the horse's feet, and it is dragged out on the floor and there killed with a pole-axe.

"There you can watch the end of those old horses; you can see it any week in Belgium. The horse is led into the yard, a man holds him by the halter, a butcher drives a knife into the horse's breast; he plunges, falls, struggles, staggers on to his feet, and falls again. All this time the blood pours out; this goes on for some minutes; at last only his tail moves, and he dies. That is how a number of old English horses are killed every week."

If there were no other reason for stopping this traffic, the method of killing the horses should surely be sufficient to make English people say: "We cannot prevent the Belgians from killing their own horses in any way they please, but we will not condemn our horses to a lingering, agonizing death." But, as yet, English people have not said that. The barbarous method of killing the horses described by Miss Cole still continues!

At the annual meeting of the Society in 1921 a resolution was unanimously passed in favour of a tax of £20 being put on every live horse, mule, or ass exported from the British Isles. This proposal

met with widespread support, and a resolution in its favour was submitted to 218 local authorities. Sixty-two of these authorities decided in favour of the proposal; fifteen altered the resolution by omitting the £20 tax or specifying that the tax should apply to worn-out horses only; eight decided on "No action." The only authority which opposed the resolution was that of Rochdale. The local authorities of Deptford, Barrow-in-Furness, Cardiff, Islington, Lambeth, Macclesfield, Stoke-on-Trent, and Colchester decided that none of their horses should be sold for export, while the Bermondsey Borough Council passed a resolution not only that all worn-out horses were to be slaughtered, but, so that there should be no doubt about the end of the horses, decided that the horse-keeper should attend all executions—an example which should be followed by all horse-owners!

The Minister, with a courage that one is bound to admire, published the report of his inspector in a White Paper which testified to the fact that the Ministry's inspectors had failed in their duty to such an extent that the Minister had to confess in Parliament that the reading of the report had "filled him with horror." And these, to quote from the report itself, are "some of the worst cases" which were passed as fit for shipment under the Acts of 1910 and 1914:

"A chestnut mare, heavy in foal, very lame; chestnut pony, very lame; brown pony, very poor, a miserable-looking skeleton; a three-year-old bay gelding with sand crack on off foreleg, not shod—should not have been passed; bay gelding, deformed foot, walked lame, and should not have been shipped,

etc., etc. . . .” “I regret to say there were a number lame from Hull and Goole. Making allowances for kicks and accidents on board ship, it was impossible to avoid the conclusion that most of the unfit animals were suffering from old-standing lameness of a character so evident that they might have been ‘substitutes’ for animals actually passed at the port of embarkation.”

No wonder that the Minister was “filled with horror” when he realized that his inspectors were guilty of cruelty of the worst kind—that of knowingly causing unnecessary suffering—and were, therefore, guilty of infringing the country’s laws. Those laws provide for prosecution and punishment where such export certificates of fitness are issued wrongfully or dishonestly, yet the only punishment meted out to these half-time inspectors was removal from the Ministry’s staff. They were, one would presume, fully qualified veterinary surgeons, members of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, able to diagnose “lameness,” “sand crack,” “deformed foot,” etc., yet having passed such cases as fit for export, they were only deprived of the opportunity of earning for themselves, as Government inspectors appointed to carry out the law, 10s. 6d. per visit to the docks, with an extra fee of sixpence per horse—such fees not to exceed a maximum of three guineas per day!

Towards the close of 1921 Miss Cole, acting on behalf of the Society, visited Leith, Glasgow, Hull, and Goole to see the results of the Society’s campaign against the traffic. She found that the traffic had been considerably reduced, partly owing to the economic conditions on the other side and partly to

the more strict examination of the horses, due to the Ministry of Agriculture having issued fresh regulations. It must be remembered, however, that from the time when the traffic was restarted after the war to March, 1921, the Ministry treated every allegation of cruelty or suffering as being based on fiction. It was the force of public opinion which made the Ministry suspicious of their own self-satisfaction.

Miss Cole continued her inquiries on the Continent, and reported that every week about two hundred partly worn-out horses were exposed to the suffering of the sea passage, to hunger and thirst, and, generally, to cruel slaughter. Some of the horses were not slaughtered on the other side; they were made to work.

In 1922 Lord Lambourne, chairman of the Society, introduced into the House of Lords a short Bill, the objects of which were :

1. To restrict the exportation of aged, worn-out, or partly worn-out horses from this country by making the fee, payable to the veterinary inspector for examination of the horse, the sum of twenty pounds; and

2. To insure that all horses rejected by the veterinary inspectors as unfit for shipment are mercifully destroyed.

The Bill was drafted with a view not to interfere with the exportation of valuable horses, or of those entered in the Stud Book of their particular breed, or of any horse under the age of five years, or of a value of £40 and over.

It is important to record that three former Presidents of the Ministry of Agriculture—as Members of the House of Lords—voted in support of this Bill.

But the Lords threw it out, as it was held to interfere with legitimate trade. The Parliamentary Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture, in opposing it, said that "at the present moment, if a horse is unfit for work or travel, it is immediately killed." This statement was certainly not in accordance with the Ministry's returns for 1921, which were :

Total number of horses shipped, 45,120; total number of horses rejected, 4,389; total number of horses slaughtered, 2!

And so the trade continues at the present time—improved in certain respects, it is true, but only improved because of the constant vigilance and agitation of the Society and others who have—and can one wonder?—no faith in inspection which has repeatedly and lamentably failed! It is comforting to know that the export of live horses has considerably decreased, but that is mainly due to the fall in the exchange, and it is comforting also to learn that the export of carcasses has considerably increased. But the trade in live animals will begin once more when conditions become more normal, because in Holland a heavy import duty has been imposed on carcasses, and, as was publicly stated in the Belgian Senate, the killing of horses in England is inconvenient for Belgium as it abolishes a weekly horse market, and Belgium loses the by-products.

It is amazing to think that some of the strongest opponents to the abolition of the export of live horses for butchery are to be found among those men who have full opportunities of appreciating the high intelligence and extraordinary nervousness of the horse, and who gain financially by horse-breeding.

Once more vested interest has interfered with a

reform which was long overdue, but in spite of that organized opposition the Bill will be introduced again, and will be persisted in until it is added to the Statute Book, so that *the cruelties inevitable to an export trade in live horses for butchery are ended for all time.*

And of the horses and ponies employed in the mines—many of whom ultimately find their way across to the Continent in what is sometimes called the “sausage boat”—what can be said of them? Of course, there are mines where everything is well managed and where the animals used for draught purposes are a source of pride; but there are others, just as there are people above ground, who care only for the work that can be squeezed out of the four-footed machines. Of course, these animals should not be allowed to work below ground with little or no hope of coming to the surface until they are no longer fit for work, and the remedy is to substitute mechanical haulage and so make such a life sentence impossible. The time is surely coming when we shall look back with horror at the employment of the little Exmoor or Iceland ponies below ground as we now think of the employment of the little chimney sweeps not one hundred years ago! Mechanical haulage in mines is increasing, and the number of animals is in proportion decreasing; but, of course, old workings of mines are not adapted for this purpose, and until animals cease to be employed the only safeguard is adequate, constant, and unexpected inspection.

Every now and again some glaring case of cruelty to a pit pony is reported in the papers, and then people who have never before given a thought to the subject write indignant letters to the papers,

What is the R.S.P.C.A. doing? Is the R.S.P.C.A. asleep? And so on.

Briefly, the facts are these. Some sixty thousand horses and ponies are employed in the mines, and the task of protecting them from ill-usage is undertaken by the Mines Department of the Government. The work of inspection is done—or, rather, is supposed to be done—by eight inspectors. If the Society were called upon to look after the same number of animals above ground they would employ at least twenty inspectors. Obviously, it is quite impossible for the Government inspectors to look once at every pony once a year, and one annual inspection is hardly sufficient.

The mines, of course, are private property, and an inspector of the Society has no more right to try and go down a pit than he has to force his way into a man's garden. Occasionally the inspectors receive permission to go down a pit; at times they are invited to go down. The Society has no reason to believe that mine owners or managers or the miners themselves are inhumane men without a thought for the ponies who help to get out the coal. Indeed, there are many instances which go to prove the contrary, but the whole system is wrong, and the fact that there is a definite shift of work for the men and no shift for the ponies is, for example, one factor which contributes to cruelty and needs amending. Bad as conditions are in some mines, it is consoling to know that in the majority of cases things are better, because, of course, there is a higher feeling for animals throughout the country, and a greater desire among all classes to prevent cruelty. Often the cases reported result from a loss of temper or a lack of

thought, which are only fresh proof of the need for education on humane lines, but now and again chance shows up what can go on, unchecked, because it is hidden away in the bowels of the earth. During the last lock-out all the animals were brought to the surface, and the Society's inspectors had an opportunity of examining the animals. All the animals of one mine, thirty in number, were found to be weak, emaciated, and suffering from sores. Several of them were lame, and practically all were unfit for work.

There was no doubt that they had all been worked up to the last minute. Two veterinary surgeons examined them on behalf of the Society, and one of them, with forty years' experience, declared that he had never seen anything so bad during the whole of his experience. Those responsible were prosecuted and convicted, but it is horrible to think that but for unexpected circumstances these cases would never have come to light. It can readily be understood, therefore, that the Society agitates for stricter and more frequent examination, which can come with the appointment of a larger number of Government inspectors under the present Coal Mines Act.

For many years the Society has been agitating on behalf of the pit ponies, and is in constant touch, when facts are brought to the notice of its administrative officials, with the Home Secretary, whose department is responsible for such matters. Years ago the Society received official assurance that the subject was constantly receiving the department's attention, and that the Society's help was welcomed. The R.S.P.C.A., therefore, endeavoured to assist in bringing about the much-needed reforms by circularizing all the mines in the United Kingdom and preparing special litera-

ture for distribution among men and boys engaged in the pits as drivers and horse-keepers. Practical advice was given in this way as to the proper treatment of the ponies.

Prosecutions were undertaken whenever it was possible to bring them, and the Society tried, without success, to obtain powers to enable their inspectors to descend the mines; the authorities preferred to instruct their own inspectors to examine into the care and treatment of the animals employed underground. The miners themselves were dissatisfied with this arrangement, and in 1909 a conference of the South Wales Federation, at which 144,768 miners were represented, passed a resolution in favour of a Bill which would have given the R.S.P.C.A. inspectors full power to go down the mines at all reasonable hours for the purpose of inspecting the animals working there. But the matter ended with the passing of that resolution, and nothing more for pit ponies was done until 1911, when a Royal Commission on Mines was appointed, at which Captain Fairholme, chief secretary of the Society, gave evidence. He pleaded for the following reforms :

1. That inspectors of the R.S.P.C.A., with a special knowledge of mining work, should be given authority to enter the mines.

2. That every animal taken into a mine should be registered and allotted a number, such number to be stamped on a metal disc to be attached to the working and stable gear—the register to be open to the inspector, and to contain a short history of each animal living underground.

3. That uniform special rules be established in all mines, as well as rules providing for the proper

stabling, shoeing, grooming, harnessing, feeding, and watering, before, during, and after the hours of labour; the calling of veterinary attention when necessary; the return to the surface when expedient of any animal owing to immature or old age, blindness, accident, or other cause.

Captain Fairholme suggested that special rules should be made compulsory, so that all mines might be brought to the same standard. He also made it quite clear that the special inspectors which the Society was prepared to appoint for duty in the mines would be directed to carry out their work in a practical and common-sense manner, just as ordinary inspectors performed their duties above ground to the general satisfaction of the public. The Society was also prepared to become a persuasive and educational agency.

The Royal Commission found that no general and widespread system of cruelty to pit ponies had been proved to exist, and thought that, generally speaking, the ponies were not overworked. Individual cases of overwork existed which could and ought to be stopped.

The Society made various suggestions which the Commission adopted for the improvement of the conditions under which the ponies worked, but the authorities declined to give the Society permission to send its inspectors into the mines. This decision is much to be regretted, for if the Society's offer had been accepted, one could feel sure that the pit ponies would now be adequately inspected.

A Coal Mines Bill was eventually introduced, and a new schedule of rules for the treatment and care of the animals was added to the Bill. Many of the Society's amendments were embodied in the rules.

Sir George Greenwood (then Mr. Greenwood) served on the House of Commons Committee to which the Coal Mines Bill was assigned, and put down a number of amendments. It was largely due to his persistence that these amendments for the benefit of the animals were accepted.

In 1913 the Government appointed inspectors to look after the ponies working in the mines, and the R.S.P.C.A. may claim some credit for any improvement in the conditions under which the ponies now work.

There, for the time being, the matter ends. When the Society hears of a case of cruelty to a pit pony it passes the information on to the Minister of Mines and asks that immediate action may be taken. Nothing more can be done, because the authorities refuse to give the Society a free hand in suppressing the cruelties to pit ponies.

People who are inclined to find fault with the R.S.P.C.A. for not protecting pit ponies from cruelty are asked to remember that the Society offered to provide all the necessary inspectors for all the mines in the country free of charge. The Government declined the offer! Unfortunately, therefore, the Society at the present time can only urge the necessity of more inspectors, call the attention of the Mines Department to any cases of cruelty that may be brought to notice, and press for the substitution of mechanical haulage wherever possible. Only in this way can the Society seek to improve the working conditions of the 60,000 pit ponies compelled to spend their working lives below ground.

When one remembers the cruelties so often inflicted on animal workers, one can only wish that they had

the power to strike, as does the human worker who, articulate with real or fancied wrongs, can take the law into his own hands and "down tools" to draw public attention to his just or unjust demands.

Would to heaven that the animals could pursue a like course! The world would then be a different and a better place, for we should have learnt how dependent on the animal kingdom we human beings are. Think, for instance, if the draught animals who are systematically overdriven and overloaded refused to leave their stables until the laws of our country were properly enforced! Where would our commerce be? How would our food be carried from the railways to the distributing centres, and from the shops to the homes? It would certainly be a difficult time—but what a glorious change would result! And, surely, the first class of animals that should strike are the animals who are victimized, often with slow and constant torture, so that empty-headed, thoughtless human beings may have an hour's amusement. Being inarticulate, they cannot strike, and so they are forced to perform unnatural and degrading antics in order that their owners may "earn a living." We cannot leave the animals in their proper places, we must drag them to the footlights, and by infinite patience (if we are to believe what we are told) train them to portray the absurd antics, and often the disgusting vices of human beings. An edifying sight, is it not, to see a dog, dressed up in all the glory of evening clothes, act the part of a drunken "man about town"?—edifying to the human beings who applaud and to the animal who is martyred to ape a human vice! Yet a turn such as this meets with applause instead of with the hisses that it merits,

and the "clever" owner nets his or her so-many pounds per week, and is engaged at other music-halls for the succeeding weeks. The dog in the meantime, with haunting remembrances of his pre-professional days spent with a kind master or mistress, in freedom, among green fields, travels in the airless box where he spends most of his time when not performing. On the stage, perhaps in a state of mental terror at the prospect of punishment for "stage fright," or its dog equivalent, the animal is seen as a public performer. There is another side to the picture. Read "Michael, Brother of Jerry," by Jack London (Mills and Boon), and if you can sit through an animal performance again and enjoy it, you must have a heart of stone and the imagination of a cabbage.

"By the book reviewers," Jack London writes, "I am esteemed a sort of primitive beast that delights in the spilled blood of violence and horror. Without arguing this matter of my general reputation, accepting it at its current face value, let me add that I have, indeed, lived life in a very rough school, and have seen more than the average man's share of inhumanity and cruelty. . . . One with a strong stomach and a hard head may be able to tolerate much of the unconscious and undeliberate cruelty and torture of the world that is perpetrated in hot blood and stupidity. I have such a stomach and head. *But what turns my head and makes my gorge rise is the cold-blooded, conscious, deliberate cruelty and torment that is manifest behind ninety-nine of every hundred trained animal turns. Cruelty, as a fine art, has attained its perfect flower in the trained animal world. . . .* But of recent years my understanding of human nature has become such that I realize that

no normal, healthy human being would tolerate such performances did he or she know the terrible cruelty that lies behind them and makes them possible. . . .

"Practically all of us will weep red tears and sweat bloody sweats as we come to knowledge of the unavoidable cruelty and brutality on which the trained animal world rests and has its being. But not one-tenth of 1 per cent. of us will join any organization for the prevention of cruelty to animals, and by our words and acts and contributions work to prevent the perpetration of cruelties on animals. This is a weakness of our own human nature. We must recognize it as we recognize heat and cold, the opaqueness of the non-transparent, and the everlasting down-pull of gravity."

And the remedy for this? Jack London has it when he writes:

"We will not have to think of dues or corresponding secretaries. We will not have to think of anything save when, in any theatre or place of entertainment, a trained animal turn is presented before us. Then, without premeditation, we may express our disapproval of such a turn by getting up from our seats and leaving the theatre for a promenade and a breath of fresh air outside, coming back, when the turn is over, to enjoy the rest of the programme. All we have to do is just that, to eliminate the trained animal turn from all public places of entertainment. Show the management that such turns are unpopular, and in a day, in an instant, the management will cease catering such turns to its audiences."

If only the public would realize that the performing animal turns entail unnecessary suffering, either in the training or in the keeping of animals in unsuitable

conditions and in almost constant confinement, the British public would surely take such simple steps as Jack London suggested, and so set an example to other countries that would end this scandal. But, as Mr. John Galsworthy wrote :

“ We, who are getting on in years, were brought up in very unimaginative times. For instance, we were never taught to think what a wretched thing it is to train animals to perform difficult tricks and drag them from country to country, town to town, platform to platform, under conditions which are always unnatural and may be horrifying.”

People may say that Jack London's book is all the result of a supersensitive nature and of a riotous imagination—that tricks are taught by kindness, and that to cow an animal with cruelty is to render it incapable of performing tricks. That may be so in certain cases where the tricks are merely developments of some natural antic of an individual animal—then, why the whip, the crowbar, the electric wire, etc.? The natural tricks of an animal are so tame that the public, while they might applaud them in their own pets at home, would not pay to see a public exhibition of them. Therefore, the trainers have to devise other and more unnatural tricks, and, to teach them, have to use brute force. Even if this were not so, the victims have to be kept in confinement and in unnatural surroundings, and have to be dragged round the country to amuse people in the various towns where they are “ billed ” to appear.

Moreover, as stated in his evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on this subject by Dr. Chalmers Mitchell, F.R.S., F.Z.S. :
 “ If, at a quarter past eight, when the bell rings and

the curtain goes up, you have to get your animals on the stage and do the tricks at once, lest the manager and the public be discontented, then, in my experience, there is the gravest possible risk that there has been cruelty, not only in training the animal, but continuous cruelty in keeping the animal up to the mark for these, what may be called, time performances."

Therefore, we must, if we would set right this wrong, follow the advice given us by Jack London, and leave the theatre or hall as a protest and as a public testimony to our own feelings. The Massachusetts S.P.C.A. some years ago led the way by forming a Jack London Club, whose members pledge themselves to carry out the suggestion made by the author, and they number already considerably over 20,000 men and women, boys and girls. The Council of the R.S.P.C.A. has followed this excellent example. A Jack London Club has been started in England. Many thousands have been enrolled and are actually co-operating in the endeavour to purge our places of amusement. By this means, and until Parliament deals with the matter once and for all, the public can do much to improve the conditions of the animals.

For many years, the R.S.P.C.A. has worked for this end, and the number of its prosecutions more than prove the contention that cruelty exists. The following are only a few cases taken from its records :

A Rooster Band of eleven cockerels was advertised at Blackpool as a continuous performance. On an inspector approaching the show, he saw two cockerels (White Leghorns) at the front, dressed in coloured clothing. On entering the show he saw a miniature stage with a painted drop curtain. The attendant

introduced the birds to the audience and described them as highly educated and trained entirely by kindness. The curtain was lifted and eight cockerels were revealed dressed in coloured uniform, with musical instruments attached. They commenced playing, and the inspector noticed the cockerels were continually flicking their heads, rolling their eyes, and opening their beaks. When the birds were taken out of their clothes they sank down completely exhausted, being too cramped to be able to walk. The legs and wings were chafed, and the cockerels were undoubtedly suffering. On one bird was a raw and bleeding sore, and there was fresh blood on the feathers. The instruments were worked by the defendant manipulating an appliance at the back of the stage, and it caused continual shaking to all the birds. After a lengthy hearing, the bench imposed a fine of £5 with £4 4s. costs.

One of the proprietors of a menagerie was prosecuted at Ottery St. Mary for causing unnecessary suffering to a bear, and was fined £10 and £1 1s. costs. During the performance, a hyena attacked the bear and bit its nose, and although the defendant was warned by the inspector at Torquay to take steps to keep the animals apart, a similar incident occurred at Sidmouth, and he was accordingly prosecuted. The defendant unsuccessfully appealed against the conviction.

At St. Helens Borough Bench, a music-hall artiste was fined £1 and 5s. costs for cruelty to a monkey by compelling it to jump from a swinging trapeze on to a fixed bar, a distance of 18 feet, the monkey sitting on the swinging trapeze. A cord was attached to the monkey and held by the defendant. He pulled

the cord and the monkey jumped from the trapeze and missed the stationary bar, 18 feet away, and fell to the ground heavily. It was again placed on the trapeze, and again it failed to jump on to the stationary bar, and it fell to the ground. The monkey was in a very frightened and terrified state. A third attempt was made to make it jump from the trapeze to the bar, but again it failed, and fell heavily.

Two showmen were prosecuted for terrifying a lioness at York. One was fined 10s. and 6s. 6d. costs, and the other £1 and £1 1s. costs. The animal was described as untameable, and before the show the defendants were in the habit of teasing and infuriating it, to give it a ferocious appearance at the show.

At the Ceylonese Village, Franco-British Exhibition, an elephant trainer was prosecuted for cruelly terrifying an elephant by compelling it to descend a steep water-chute. He was fined 40s. and 2s. costs. In the same case, another elephant trainer was fined £5 and £7 7s. costs, and also the menagerie proprietor, for permitting the cruelty, was bound over in the sum of £10 for twelve months.

An animal trainer was prosecuted for causing a cat to be injured at the Lyceum Theatre, London, at an animal performance, and was fined, in one case, 40s. and 44s. costs, and for a like offence on another occasion, a similar amount.

A man was fined 40s. for ill-treating a lioness, which was kept in a cage 4 feet wide and 8 feet long. Before each performance, the animal was jabbed and prodded about the eyes, nose, and mouth with a stick in order to stir her up and make her, in the words of the advertisement of the show, "a wild beast of the forest—an untameable, man-eating animal." An inspector

said the lioness was old, toothless, decrepit, and bow-legged.

But prosecution, however persistent, cannot end the scandal. The real and permanent remedy is the passing of a Bill either to regulate, or, better still, to abolish the training and performances of such animals. To this end, and aided by the Performing Animals Defence League, Commander the Hon. J. M. Kenworthy (M.P. for Central Hull) introduced a Bill, but it was not successful, though it resulted in drawing public attention to the question, and Parliament set up a Select Committee to consider the whole matter.

Many people, including managers of theatres and music-halls and actors, gave evidence, and the Society's representatives, by records of prosecutions and from personal experience, testified to the urgent necessity for safeguarding the animals. As was to be expected, a great deal of evidence as to the kindly treatment of such animals and the ideal conditions under which they lived was given by animal trainers and others interested financially in the matter, but, to quote from a leading article in *The Times*, the evidence "established the existence of cruelty, both in training and in exhibition, so definitely that the Committee might well have gone farther than the recommendation. . . . If, as we hope, the labours of the Committee result in a charter for animals, those most in need of protection should not be given lesser right."

At the time of writing, this "charter for animals" has, unfortunately, not become an accomplished fact. In spite of the Select Committee's recommendation, the Government would not undertake to introduce such a Bill, and it was left to a private member (Brigadier-General Colvin, chairman of the Select Com-

mittee), supported by other members of that Committee, to introduce a Bill to regulate the exhibition and training of performing animals. This passed second reading, was amended by one of the Standing Committees of Parliament, and was awaiting the report stage, prior to third reading, when Parliament was dissolved. And so the various stages of the procedure have to be gone through again, and in the meantime animals are still subjected to close confinement, ill-treatment in many cases, and the unnatural life of the unfortunate creature whose intelligence has singled him out for the high honour of being made into a "performing animal."

We have gone rather fully into the difficulties of effecting these needed reforms to show the reader that it is not an easy matter to bring about a change, however desirable it may be. People draw the attention of the Society to some existing evil, demand that it should be stopped instantly, and blame the Society when they find that time passes and little has been done. The machinery of Government departments and Parliament works exceedingly slowly. No doubt it is right that reformative measures should not be hastily created; but the tragedy lies in the fact that the animals still have to suffer while our legislators are considering the pros and cons of the case.

CHAPTER XVI

AFTER ONE HUNDRED YEARS

WOULD that Broome, Martin, and the early pioneers could be with us to celebrate the centenary of that great Society, to the founding of which they gave so much of their time, energy, and strength. One cannot but speculate as to what they would feel in realizing that the seeds which they had sown and husbanded had brought forth such an abundant harvest in all parts of the civilized globe. And surely they would have taken comfort from the thought that the methods of work which they had so carefully drawn up were still the same methods in use to-day. "The principal means to be employed by the Society" as laid down by them at that first meeting at Slaughter's Coffee House, on June 16, 1824, are still the guiding principles of the work at the present time, save only that they have been adapted to march with the times and fit in with the wonderful growth of the Society's operations. From that handful of men with vision has sprung up an army of workers for the animals, speaking with many different tongues, but working with one central aim and for one single purpose. In England and Wales alone—for that is the sphere of the Society's own active operations—they would have found thousands of voluntary workers, secretaries, collectors, and committees, giving their time and energy to the cause in over thirteen hundred branches and auxiliary branches of the R.S.P.C.A. and maintaining over two hundred inspectors, working in

defined areas all dovetailing in like a great jig-saw puzzle, to ensure that the country is patrolled and watched.

The foresight of those early pioneers is abundantly proved by the steady and inspiring growth of the work. In looking back into the past, and realizing the difficulties which have been overcome, one can surely take courage for the future because the successes which have crowned past efforts are constant reminders of Herrick's words :

Attempt the end, and never stand to doubt ;
Nothing too hard but search will find it out.

In gathering up the threads of the Society's work during the past hundred years—and if space had but permitted, we could have dealt more adequately with the minor details of what has now become a great and essential movement of modern civilization—the outstanding impression one gets is the steady and natural growth of the Society's influence on mankind as a whole. It is a story of gradual achievements, which have brought about many changes in the country's manners, customs, and thoughts barely dreamed of by those who first conceived the idea of founding such a work. Its organization has naturally expanded, and is expanding as more people are inspired by its example to carry the teaching into other lands, but it is fundamentally the same as planned a century ago. And the system of voluntary work and voluntary support which founded it has more than maintained it, even though, as at the present time, people have to face far heavier expenses, and therefore have a smaller margin for charitable subscriptions.

Naturally, as is the case with all societies and institutions, the R.S.P.C.A. has to employ a staff of paid workers to carry out the administrative work at headquarters, but the vast majority of its work is done by volunteers who strive against many difficulties to enlist new supporters and maintain the enthusiasm of those already gained. And that such a system is more than successful can be judged from the fact that, for example, whereas in 1905 434 branches and auxiliaries subscribed £14,500 to maintain 124 inspectors, in 1922, close on 1,300 branches and auxiliaries collected, in spite of the greater cost of living, nearly £34,000 to maintain 203 inspectors and defray the greatly increased cost of the work. Each year shows, as should be with any work that is live and progressive, a greatly increased public interest. In 1921, 12,926 complaints were investigated; in 1922, the number had grown to 15,335, while in 1923 the complaints had increased to 18,470—and these all came from members of the public eager to right a wrong and end some special cases of unnecessary suffering. And yet, in spite of that, and of the wide publicity which is given to its work, there are still a great many people who know very little of its work. As is only right in such a work which depends entirely on the co-operation of the public, the Society has never tried to hide its light under a bushel. It has been so long established that some people erroneously imagine that the Society is a Government department financed by Government; while others, taking everything for granted, ignore its work and so fail to realize its utility and necessity. Many people think of it as a prosecuting society—some, who have been found out, naturally consider it to be a *persecuting* one—because

the newspapers report the majority of the prosecutions undertaken every year by the Society. Then, too, because it so happens that almost half of those cases are undertaken on behalf of ill-used horses, the public are led to think that the work of the Society begins and ends with maintaining a staff of inspectors who find out the people who are cruel to their horses. This is far from the truth, but it is not the fault of the papers that this wrong idea of the Society's work prevails. The papers cannot report matters which cannot be made public. For every person prosecuted for cruelty to animals five persons are cautioned by the inspectors, and all these cautions, which amount to over twenty thousand a year, are given privately.

A word as to the reports of the Society's cases. We often wonder if the brutes who are punished for cruelty to animals realize the enormous amount of publicity which the Press gives to their evil deeds. Reports of any serious or uncommon cases are copied by papers all over the kingdom; the public are evidently interested in this part of the Society's work, and like to be assured that people who are brutal to animals are punished.

The bundle of press cuttings which reaches us every morning would be larger than it is if the Society's work lent itself to illustrations. Many times are we approached by journalists who wish to have photographs for illustrating an article about the Society. Very few such photographs exist, for the simple reason that when an animal is being ill-used the Society does not stop to have the action photographed; its first concern is for the animal. Occasionally, when they are necessary to assist the work of prosecution, photographs of an ill-used animal are taken, but pictures of

diseased horses very much on their last legs are not pretty enough to go with magazine articles.

It is not generally realized—though speakers sent out by the Society are continually trying to enlighten the public on this point—that the services of the Society are at the disposal of the general public. Many people still believe that unless they are members or supporters of the Society it is useless for them to seek the assistance of an inspector in alleviating the sufferings of an animal. This is not so. Anyone is at liberty to report a case of cruelty to an animal, and all complaints are investigated without any expense to the complainants, whose names are withheld unless testimony as witness is essential. It can be readily understood that the Society's post-bag is a pretty heavy one each day. For instance, 68,000 letters were received and 75,000 were sent out in 1923, without counting the many circular letters, letters to the Press, etc.

The Society works only in England and Wales; separate societies, as has been said, operate in Scotland and Ireland; with these, and with the many humane societies scattered about all over the world, the R.S.P.C.A. is continually in touch. Representatives of foreign societies frequently call at the offices of the parent Society for hints and information; in the sense that its services are always at the disposal of such societies, the R.S.P.C.A. does work all over the world, but its inspectors do not go outside England and Wales.

The Society prides itself on being the guardian of the nation's animals, and its inspectors are specially trained for their work. The training, which is carried out under the supervision of the Society's veterinary

surgeon at the headquarters of the Society, and by courtesy of the committee at the Home of Rest for Horses,* is of a very varied nature. Many a man interested in horses could tell at once what was wrong with a sick or lame horse, but the same man would be nonplussed if you asked him to say what was wrong with a crate of poultry, or a cage of newly caught chaffinches, or a performing monkey, or a tortoise that did not seem to be in good health, or a distressed cow that was calling attention to herself, and so on. The inspectors acquire a knowledge of all animals and their ailments, of the various Acts of Parliament for the prevention of cruelty to animals, and of the procedure of a police court.

When trained, the inspectors are drafted into branches to work defined areas under the supervision of a local committee. All reports of cases are forwarded to headquarters for supervision and consideration, and prosecutions are ordered or monitions are sent direct from headquarters. This absolves the local branches from the odium of being responsible for, and from the accusation of being biassed by, local interference. Each branch is asked to contribute a

* The Home of Rest for Horses, now at Cricklewood, was founded through the instrumentality of Miss Lindo in 1886. This lady's experience of rescuing a horse which she had rested and rejuvenated inspired her with the idea of starting a convalescent home for the horses of poor people whose living depended on the work of such animals. Mr. John Colam encouraged the idea, an appeal was issued in the Society's monthly, *Animal World*, for February, 1886, and on May 10, a meeting was held in the R.S.P.C.A.'s board-room under the chairmanship of Sir Francis Burdett, whose son is the present chairman of the Home. The Home does real and much-needed work in preventing cruelty, and many a poor man's horse—the bread-winner of the family—has been given free veterinary treatment and much-needed rest, to enable it to continue at its work without pain.

fixed sum annually towards the expenses of the local inspector and his work, including travelling, prosecution costs, etc. Many branches loyally keep the unwritten contract, some, indeed, contribute more, because they realize that the sum asked does not cover local expenses, but others are not able to contribute the required amount, and the annual deficit has to be met by headquarters.

The Society has, quite wrongly, a reputation for being wealthy because of the munificence of some of its friends who bequeath it legacies. Were it not for these legacies, many of the Society's activities in educational and other propaganda would have to be curtailed, and the staff of inspectors reduced. The Council realize that these legacies are left, not so much to provide a fixed income, but rather to maintain and extend the work so that the campaign against cruelty may go on with greater force, until that Utopia shall have been reached when British animals will no longer have to be protected from the brutality, greed, or thoughtlessness of British men, women, and children. Indeed, had the Society all the wealth which it is reported to possess, it would be able to realize its dearest wish—to have an adequate number of inspectors to insure that all the animals in the country could come under the care of the R.S.P.C.A. But there are, alas! still many districts which are far too large for the inspectors engaged in them, and so many cases go undetected which, if means allowed, would be discovered and dealt with.

It is advisable to emphasise the fact that the inspectors' work is limited to the duties they perform for the Society. Inspectors are never authorized to act as unqualified veterinary surgeons and attend

animals for people who can well afford to pay the fees of a properly qualified man. But let any poor man—say, an ex-service man about to spend his whole capital on a horse to help him to earn a living—let such a man go to any of our inspectors for advice and it will be given freely and gratuitously. In this way the Society prevents the ex-service man from being swindled by an unscrupulous dealer, and also prevents him from buying and then working some aged, decrepit horse which to the inexperienced eye may seem sound enough but which the inspectors know is worthless. The Society is always glad of the opportunity of helping such cases and so prevent cruelty to animals at one and the same time.

It is sometimes suggested that the Society might with advantage disband its staff of inspectors and devote its energies solely to propaganda work. This question was discussed again and again in the early days of the Society, and it was shown that only by employing a large staff of inspectors could the Society prevent a vast amount of cruelty to animals. It must be remembered that the inspectors do not wait for cases to be brought to them; they go out to look for them in all places where animals are to be found, from a crowded racecourse to a lonely country lane. The working hours of an inspector of the Society are not trades union hours. He is always liable to be called upon at any hour of the day or night, and on any day of the week.

As matters now stand, we have wise laws for the protection of animals, but these laws would be seldom enforced if there were no inspectors to discover the offenders. R.S.P.C.A. inspectors are now recognized by the authorities all over the country, and it is in-

variably found that the mere presence of an inspector at any place where animals are to be found acts as a warning to those who are disposed to be unkind to their animals. The Society's statistics do not and cannot show all the cruelty which the inspectors prevent.

If the R.S.P.C.A. staff of inspectors were disbanded, the animals of the country would be left to the protection of the police, and the force—paid for out of public rates—would have to be greatly increased. The Society is deeply indebted to the police all over the country for their kind co-operation; they are always ready to assist the Society's inspectors, but if the police were consulted regarding the suggestion that they should do the work of R.S.P.C.A. inspectors, we believe we know what their answer would be:

“We have other duties—to human beings.”

The police, of course, undertake a great many prosecutions for cruelty to animals apart from the Society, but these are mostly cases met with in the streets. It is no part of a policeman's duty to search the country for any animals who may be unhappy, though a policeman will always act on behalf of an ill-treated animal if his attention is called to it.

The advantage of having a system of inspectors all over the country, keeping in close touch with one another, is noticeable when, for example, a case of cruelty to a performing animal has to be dealt with. An inspector goes to a music-hall and notices that all is not well with one of the animals in a troupe. He sees the exhibitor of the animal, gives him a word of caution and advice, and the show moves on. The owner of the animal may think that the matter is

ended. Not so. Headquarters, or the inspector, discovers the name of the town in which the troupe will be appearing in the following week, and word is passed on to the inspector of that town to keep an eye on that troupe of performing animals. The work of inspecting these animals is continued until matters are put right—if any troupe of performing animals can ever be considered to be right. Personally, we do not think so.

All the propaganda work of the Society is carried on from the Society's headquarters—105, Jermyn Street, London. Only by trying to influence public opinion can many forms of cruelty be attacked, and this is done by letters to the Press, by public addresses, and the publication of hundreds of pamphlets. If the temper of the people is sufficiently aroused on any question relating to animals, the powers that be will generally act at once. At times, a new law or an amending law may be required. The new Bill is drawn up in the offices of the Society, ready at the right time, together with the man who will introduce it, for the Society has always been fortunate in having supporters in Parliament. Incidentally, we may mention that practically every Act which has been passed for the benefit of animals has been introduced into Parliament by a member of the Society.

In connection with this propaganda work of the Society, perhaps one of the most successful campaigns of recent years dealt with the prohibition of the sale of certain feathers for millinery purposes, a trade which involved either great cruelty or wanton destruction of beautiful birds. For many years, in conjunction with the Royal Society for the Protection of

Birds,* the Society had agitated for a Bill prohibiting the import of such feathers as, for example, the egret plumes, which are the marriage plumes of the greater and lesser herons, and which were obtained by the slaughter of the mother birds and the death, by neglect and starvation, of the nestlings. After an agitation extending for over fifty years, and the failure of many Bills, the Plumage Act was successfully passed in 1921. Thanks are due to the Plumage Group (founded by Mr. H. G. Massingham, Mr. Willoughby Dewar, and Mrs. Reginald McKenna) for the great help given in this matter. It is comforting to know that, while the Act does not go as far as might have been hoped, it does prevent the import into this country of the feathers of many rare birds, including the egret, bird of paradise, crown pigeons, silver pheasants, etc. Under the Act, an Advisory Committee, appointed by the Board of Trade, deals with trade applications for the addition of birds to, or their removal from, the existing schedule. Two representatives of the Plumage Group, as well as the secretary of the R.S.P.C.A., sit upon the committee, which includes also representatives of the trade. The committee goes into the trade claims with great care, and as a result of these deliberations, out of the 19,000 species of birds in the world, only 10 are at present allowed to be imported.

The R.S.P.C.A. tries to encourage people to be

* The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds was founded in 1889 by Mrs. Williamson, of Manchester, and received the title Royal from H.M. King Edward VII. in 1904. Its forerunner was "The Plumage League," founded at Broadlands, Romsey, Hants, by Lady Mount Temple, with among its first members the Rev. F. O. Morris, the well-known naturalist, and John Ruskin, who had in 1871 founded the Society of St. George, which was intended to "embrace all holy and humble men of heart."

kind to animals, especially those people who earn their living with the aid of animals. Thus, at horse parades and shows all over the country, the Society awards its brass Badges of Merit for the animals in the best working condition, and so each year hundreds of drivers and horse-keepers are encouraged to look after the animals in their charge. In many seaside towns, annual parades of the beach donkeys and ponies are held, and prizes are awarded to the owners and drivers of the best animals; at many seaside places, the Society has induced local authorities to pass a by-law prohibiting anyone weighing over nine stone from riding on a donkey.

One of the most pleasant branches of the Society's work is the awarding of silver or bronze medals "for animal life-saving," which were inaugurated in 1908. Since that date, 371 gallant rescues of animals at great risk of life have been rewarded. In the early days of the Society, people would have laughed at the idea of risking their lives to rescue a dying dog or cat brutally thrown down some deep and disused mine-shaft, but the statistics of such cases of rescue show, year by year, that people realize more and more the sacredness of life and the duty, even at great personal risk and discomfort, of saving animals from a lingering and often painful death. These cases include rescues of horses, cattle, sheep, goats, poultry, dogs, cats, birds, etc., by saving them from burning stables and other buildings, by rescuing them from the sea, rivers, docks, lakes, etc., from high trees, tall chimneys and dangerous positions on cliffs, and by descending old, deep, and disused pit shafts in which unfortunate animals would otherwise have starved to death.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the Society spends a

considerable sum every year in humanely killing thousands of animals. We refer to the army of unwanted, homeless, and diseased cats which roam about London. The most kind action that one can do for such animals is to give them a painless death, and this, in London, the Society does on the premises of the Animal Rescue League, 397, City Road, Islington, where over 50,000 cats and dogs are humanely destroyed every year.

This institution was founded by Miss Kate Cording, who sacrificed herself for it. She gave up all her time and money to the self-appointed task of lessening the sufferings of London's homeless cats—the despised strays of the streets. For some years, the Society assisted Miss Cording by subscribing an annual sum towards her institution, and on her death, in 1913, the Society took over the management of the place. Many of the Society's branches also have cats' shelters, homes of rest for horses, and animal hospitals doing similar good work.

We cannot close this record of a hundred years' work for animals without acknowledging the great services rendered to the Society by John Colam, who was for forty-five years—May, 1860, to July, 1905—secretary of the Society. When he took up the work, the Society employed only six or seven inspectors; when he left, the number was 157. In 1860, there were very few country branches; in 1905, there were 434 branches and auxiliaries. In 1860, the expenses of the Society were met by an income of £1,500; in 1905, the branches alone contributed ten times that amount, and yet the sum was insufficient to meet the expenses of the branches. For this great increase in the activities of the Society, all credit is due to John

Colam, who worked indefatigably during his long term of service. In addition to being secretary, he was editor of the *Animal World*, the official magazine of the Society, from 1869 to 1905, and editor of the *Band of Mercy*, the children's magazine, from 1880 to 1905. But however much any one individual may work in the cause of the animals, it is the collective enthusiasm of the many which really advances the cause, and for this the Society have to thank the thousands of voluntary workers of the past and that large army who, at the present, with an enthusiasm which overcomes the handicaps which have arisen as aftermath of the Great War, are leading the R.S.P.C.A. to still greater success. And, in recalling the difficult times since August, 1914, when pessimists prophesied reductions of income and a consequent reduction of work, one must emphasise a deep gratitude to all who have striven on behalf of the animals, and of the R.S.P.C.A., to make it the successful institution it is to-day. In spite of the war, or, perhaps, because of the suffering which it entailed, there is now ample evidence of a greater desire to prevent cruelty and to encourage kindness, and the Society's workers, voluntary and paid alike, are bearing their part splendidly in the fight against cruelty, whether it be caused by thoughtlessness or by brutality. And in this work the inspectors of the R.S.P.C.A. have played, and are playing, an important part; they help to humanize those people who should be responsible for the lives and well-being of so many dumb animals, and who, alas! only abuse them because they are in their power.

We feel sure that the historian who will be privileged to record the second hundred years' work of the

Society will have much to say about the advantages of humane education—for therein lies the hope of the future. When once the Government and the teachers of this country have come to realize the full importance of a systematic teaching (enforced, if need be, by law) of kindness to animals in all schools and classes, the need for inspectors will gradually vanish. All men and women, with a due respect for animal rights instilled by daily lesson and practice, will instinctively be just, not only to all animals, but also to one another. When that time comes, the object of the Society will have been realized, and the monument to Broome and Martin will have been completed.

APPENDIX

PRESIDENTS, CHAIRMEN, AND SECRETARIES OF THE R.S.P.C.A.

THE chairmen at the Society's meetings were :

- 1824.—T. Fowell Buxton, M.P.
- 1825.—J. A. Warre, M.P.
- 1826.—W. A. Mackinnon, M.P.
- 1827.—W. A. Mackinnon, M.P.
- 1828.—C. N. Pallmer, M.P.
- 1829.—Sir George Duckett.
- 1830.—W. A. Mackinnon, M.P.
- 1831.—J. G. Meymott.
- 1832.—Sir John De Beauvoir, Bart.
- 1833.—Sir John De Beauvoir, Bart.

PRESIDENTS

- 1834-1849.—The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Carnarvon.
- 1850-1853.—The Duke of Beaufort, K.G.
- 1854-1860.—The Marquess of Westminster, K.G. (afterwards the Duke of Westminster).
- 1861-1877.—The Earl of Harrowby, K.G.
- 1878-1892.—The Rt. Hon. Lord Aberdare, G.C.B.
- 1893-1899.—H.R.H. the Duke of York, K.G. (King George V.).
- 1900-1909.—H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, K.G. (King George V.).
- 1910-1917.—The Most Hon the Marquess of Cambridge, G.C.B., G.C.V.O.
- 1918.—H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, K.G., K.T.

CHAIRMEN*

- 1886-1899.—Sir George Measom.
 1900.—Major-General Sir Francis de Winton, G.C.M.G.
 1901-1908.—Sir Arthur Guillum Scott.
 1909-1918.—Colonel Sir Edward Ward, Bart., G.B.E.,
 K.C.B., K.C.V.O.
 1919.—Colonel the Rt. Hon. Lord Lambourne, C.V.O.

SECRETARIES

- 1824-1828.—The Rev. Arthur Broome.
 1828-1832.—Lewis Gompertz.
 1832-1835.—Timothy Thomas.
 1835-1854.—Henry Thomas.
 1854-1860.—George Middleton.
 1860-1905.—John Colam.
 1905-1908.—{ Captain G. L. Derriman.
 { Edward G. Fairholme.
 1908.—Captain Edward G. Fairholme, O.B.E.

* No permanent chairmen were appointed until 1886, before which time any member of the council served as chairman for the meeting.

INDEX

- ABERDARE, Lord, President, R.S.P.C.A.,** views on vivisection, 197, 198
Africa, humane work in, 226, 227
America, humane work in, 159, 164, 167, 228-237
Angell, G. T.: interest in humane education, 137; his work in Boston, 232, 233
Animal Defenders Corps, 172
Animal World, the, 289
Animals, future life of, 4-6; skinned alive, 174, 175; protected abroad, 225, 238
Banbury, Lord, member of Council, R.S.P.C.A.: introduces Wild Animals in Captivity Protection Act, 149; evidence before Royal Commission on Vivisection, 200
Band of Mercy, the, 164, 166, 171
Bear-baiting, 4
Bergh, Henry, his work in America, 228-231, 234
Bentham, Jeremy, on legislation for animals, 12
Birds, cruelty to, 88, 89, 155; protection of, 131, 135, 145, 148, 286 (footnote)
Brakes to omnibuses, 242
Broome, the Rev. Arthur, founder of R.S.P.C.A.: tribute from Richard Martin, 49; his early life, 50; his editions of Dr. Primatt's book on cruelty, 51, 63; his efforts to found Society, 52; employs first inspector, 53; resigns living to found R.S.P.C.A., 54; speech at first meeting of Society, 55; imprisoned for Society's debts, 61; thanked by the Society, 62, 63; his death, 64
Bull-baiting, 3, 4, 16-21, 39, 74-79
Burdett-Coutts, the Baroness, president of Ladies' Committee, 98, 137; lays foundation-stone of R.S.P.C.A. headquarters, 135; presides at Band of Mercy conference, 168, 169
Buxton, T. Fowell, chairman at Society's first meeting, 55
Calves, cruelty to, 88, 133, 134
Canada, humane work in, 226
Canning, George, on bull-baiting, 18
Carnarvon, the Earl of, President, R.S.P.C.A., on Society's success, 90; on cruelty to dogs, 111; speech in Lords, 115
Cartwright, Thomas, on bull-baiting, 16
Cash, Christopher, his work for humane slaughtering of animals, 189
Cats, cruelty to, 67, 70, 83-85
Cattle, dishorning, 146
Children, cruelty of, 162, 170; protection of, 165
Cock-fighting, 71-82
Cock-throwing, 5

- Colam, John, secretary, R.S.P.C.A. : presented with first "Queen's Medal," 95; his interest in Dogs' Home, 125; assists in formation of N.S.P.C.C., 165; evidence before Royal Commission on Vivisection, 195; his work for wounded war horses, 205; tribute to, 288, 289
- Cole, Miss A. F. M., her work to suppress traffic in worn-out horses, 252, 255, 256, 258, 259
- Cows, overstocking, 147
- Cruelties, early, 66, 67, 70
- Cruelty, complaints of, 91
- Daily Mail*, the, articles, denouncing traffic in worn-out horses, 247, 248
- Derriman, Captain, general secretary, R.S.P.C.A., invented humane killer, 183
- Dickens on Richard Martin, 44
- "Dissertation on the Duty of Mercy and Sin of Cruelty," 10, 160
- Dogs, fighting, 4, 28, 29, 39, 71; cruelty to, 104-126; turnspits, 105, 106, 107; hydrophobia scares, 109; shot in Hyde Park, 109; first Act to protect, 109; as beasts of burden, 110-117; water in streets for, 114; cropping ears of, 118-122; Home for Lost, 123, 178; chained-up, 125, 126, 156; stealing, 128, 129; improperly killing, 146, 147; Soldiers' Dog Fund, 217-224
- "Dog-whippers," 83
- Donkeys, cruelty to, 87
- Duchess of Albany, the, presents R.S.P.C.A. prizes, 94
- Duke of Cambridge, the, on Society's early days, 97
- Duke of Edinburgh, the, on Royal Family's interest in animals, 93
- Edinburgh Review*, the, views on legislation for animals, 23
- "Elements of Morality," 15
- Erskine, Lord : Bill to prevent cruelty, 21; speech in Lords, 22, introduces second Bill, 23
- Essay competitions, 90, 163, 166, 171, 194
- "Essay on Humanity to Animals," an, 14
- Fairholme, Captain E. G., chief secretary, R.S.P.C.A. : visit to French Front, 211; appointed Deputy Assistant Director of Veterinary Services, 213; efforts to suppress traffic in worn-out horses, 248; evidence before Royal Commission on Mines, 264, 265
- First case under Martin's Act, 31
- Founder of the R.S.P.C.A., the. (See the Rev. Arthur Broome.)
- "Four Stages of Cruelty," 5
- "Free Thoughts upon the Brute Creation," 5
- Funeral plumes, 242
- Gompertz, Lewis : aids founder of R.S.P.C.A., 61; assists in work, 62; second secretary, R.S.P.C.A., 65; his books, 65; his services to R.S.P.C.A., 67; awarded Society's medal, 68; resignation, 68; tribute to, 69
- Granger, the Rev. James, preaches first sermon on cruelty to animals, 7
- Greenwood, Sir George, mem-

- ber of R.S.P.C.A. council :
drafts and secures passing
of Protection of Animals
Act, 1911, 153; efforts in
Commons for worn-out
horses, 247, 251; work on
Coal Mines Bill Committee,
266
- Hale, Sir Matthew, on cruelty,
3
- "Hell of Horses," the, 10
- "History of the Robins," 15
- Hogarth on cruelty, 5
- Horse-baiting, 4
- Horses, cruelty to, 87, 127,
130, 132, 240, 241; traffic in
worn-out, 100, 242-261; war,
204-217; shoe competition,
241; Home of Rest for, 280,
281
- Humane education, 90, 159,
161-163, 171, 172
- Humane killer, the R.S.P.C.A.,
183, 184
- Humane slaughter of animals,
6, 57, 67, 173-190
- "If I had a donkey," etc., 33
- India, humane work in, 227
- Inspectors, work of, 173, 284;
special training of, 280, 281;
officially recognized, 283
- Kennel Club, the, and crop-
ping, 122, 123
- Killer, the R.S.P.C.A. humane,
183, 184
- King Edward, Patron of
Society, 97; letter to Society,
97; speech by, 98; disap-
proval of cruel customs, 99,
100, 123; abolished Royal
Buckhounds, 99; inquired
into traffic in worn-out
horses, 100, 251
- King George, Patron of
Society: interest in Society,
101; first Royal President of
R.S.P.C.A. (when Duke of
York), 101
- Lambourne, Lord, chairman,
R.S.P.C.A.: on increase of
vivisection, 198; member of
Royal Commission on Vivi-
section, 202; efforts to secure
new legislation, 202; petitions
King of Belgians on traffic
in worn-out horses, 254;
heads deputation to Minister
of Agriculture, 255; presides
at mass meeting at Albert
Hall, 1921, 255; introduces
Bill to restrict traffic in
horses, 259
- Landseer, Sir Edwin, vice-
president, R.S.P.C.A., 120;
his views on cropping dogs
and docking horses, 120;
speech at R.S.P.C.A. meet-
ing, 120
- Lawrence, John, on need of
laws for animals, 13; friend
of Richard Martin, 25; on
slaughter-house cruelties,
173
- Laws: Stage Coaches Bill, 24;
Martin's Act, 26, 27, 28, 40,
43, 56, 142, 144; Poisoned
Flesh Prohibition Act, 131;
Poisoned Grain Prohibition
Act, 131; Act for Protection
of Sea Birds, 135; Biblical,
139; in Middle Ages, 139;
Act of 1835, 143; Act of
1849, 143, 145, 153; Act of
1854, 145; Act of 1876,
147, 196, 197; Wild Birds
Protection Act, 148; Wild
Animals in Captivity Protec-
tion Act, 149; Coal Mines
Act, 152; Protection of
Animals Act, 1911, 153;
Poultry Act, 156; Exporta-
tion of Horses Act, 1912,

- 156, 253; Animals Anæsthetic Act, 1919, 157; Captive Birds Shooting (Prohibition) Act, 1921, 157; Importation of Plumage (Prohibition) Act, 157
- Lion-baiting, 41
- Liverpool Society for the Suppression of Wanton Cruelty to Animals, 23
- Mackinnon, W. A., introduces Bill, 1832, 70
- Mackintosh, Sir James, member of first committee, R.S.P.C.A., 55; on need of humane slaughtering, 57
- Malicious injury to animals, 11
- Martin, Richard : his first Bill, 25; his Act, 26, 27, 28, 40, 43, 56, 142, 144; his appearance, 28, 47; cases brought by, 28, 31, 34-37, 40; forbids publication of his speeches in Commons, 29; speech at first annual meeting of Society, 37; unsuccessful efforts in Parliament, 39, 42; his death, 44; Dickens on, 44; his early life, 45; friendship with George IV., 45, 46; Sir Jonah Barrington on, 46; S. C. Hall on, 47; his last days, 48; his tribute to founder of R.S.P.C.A., 49; his views on Society's policy, 56; member of Society's first committee, 173; views on vivisection, 191, 192
- Mental suffering of animals, 150, 155
- Metropolitan Drinking Fountain and Cattle Trough Association, the, 134
- Michell, Miss Maria, her work for the Society, 166
- Monthly Magazine, the, suggestions for forming Society, 24
- "Moral Conversations and Stories," 15
- Motor-cars and horses, 239, 240, 241
- Murray, Colonel the Hon. Arthur, member of Society's council: introduces Bill to restrict traffic in horses, 253
- Paddison, R. O. P., honorary humane slaughtering adviser to Society, his work, 187
- Pease, Joseph, secures passing of Act, 1835, 71, 73
- Performing animals, 15, 149, 150, 151, 268-274, 284, 285
- Pigs, cruelty to, 87
- Pit ponies, 151, 152, 261-266
- Plumage Group, the, 286
- Pole-traps, 148
- Portland, the Duke of, chairman of the R.S.P.C.A. Sick and Wounded Horses Fund, 207
- Poultry, cruelty to, 156
- Primatt, Dr. Humphrey, on cruelty, 10, 160
- Prince Albert Victor (the Duke of Clarence), at Society's meeting, 98
- Prince of Wales, the, President of R.S.P.C.A., 102
- "Prince," the story of, 222, 223
- Princess Beatrice, presents R.S.P.C.A. prizes, 94
- Princess Christian, presents R.S.P.C.A. prizes, 94
- Princess Royal, the, presents R.S.P.C.A. prizes, 94
- Princess Victoria, becomes patron of Society, 1835, 72
- Prosecutions, increase in number of, 90
- Punishment, inadequate, 130, 158

- Queen Alexandra: presents R.S.P.C.A. prizes, 94, 98; Patron of Society, 97; dislike of pigeon shooting, 100; disapproval of the wearing of ospreys, 100; letter to Society, 100; interest in R.S.P.C.A. Fund for Sick and Wounded Horses, 101; appreciation of work of R.S.P.C.A., 101; inquiries into traffic in worn-out horses, 251
- Queen Mary: presents R.S.P.C.A. prizes, 94; disapproval of the wearing of ospreys, 102
- Queen Victoria: love of cats, 83, 94; Patron of Society, 89, grants prefix "Royal" to Society, 89; letter to Society, 92; interest in Society, 94, 95; special medal, 94; reply to Society's address, 95; presents R.S.P.C.A. prizes, 96; love of dogs, 96; views on vivisection, 96; love of birds, 97
- R.S.P.C.A., the: first meeting, 54; first year's work, 59; first annual meeting, 60; early difficulties, 60, 61, 62, 67; awards to humane drivers, 74; prefix "Royal" granted by Queen Victoria, 89; first sermon in aid of, 91; fines not accepted by, 91; jubilee of, 92, 93; foundation-stone of building laid, 136; children's branches, 159-172; Band of Mercy formed by, 164, 167, 168, 169, 171; essay competitions, 90, 163, 166, 171, 194; lecturers, 171; Animal Defenders Corps, 172, war work, 204-224; Sick and Wounded Horses Fund, 207-217, 223; official recognition of, 208, 209; chief secretary's visit to the Front, 211; Commander-in-Chief's thanks to, 215; work for Australian and Canadian contingents, 216, 217; scope of work, 276; 1,300 branches and auxiliary branches, 276; voluntary support of, 277, 289; increase of public interest in, 278; inspectors specially trained, 280, 281; need for more inspectors, 282; advice to ex-service men, 283; propaganda work, 285; medals for animal life saving, 287; Animal Rescue League, 288
- Reading case, the, 189
- Richardson, Sir Benjamin Ward: experiments with electricity for humane slaughter of animals, 178; views on vivisection, 194
- Romilly, Sir Samuel, love of cats, 12
- Royal Buckhounds abolished, 99
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, the, 286 (foot-note)
- Scott, Sir Guillum, chairman of Society, evidence before Royal Commission on Vivisection, 200
- Sermon on cruelty, the first, 7
- Sheep, branding of, 147
- Sheridan, R. B., on cruelty to animals, 17, 19
- Smithfield Market, 11, 88, 177
- Smithies, Mr. and Mrs., their Band of Mercy work, 166, 167
- Soldiers' Dog Fund, R.S.P.C.A., 217-223
- "Spinning Cockchafers," 162

- Stillman, Dr., his humane work in America, 236
- "Stonehenge" on cropping, 121, 122
- Suckling, Mrs., her work for the Society, 166, 168
- "Thoughts on Education," 4
- Trace horses, 85
- Trained lamb, a, 175
- Transit of animals, the, 132, 136, 156
- Trials of animals, 140, 141
- Trimmer, Mrs., on kindness to animals, 15
- Vivisection, 96, 191-203
- War horses, Society's work for wounded, 204-217
- Westminster Pit, the, 28
- Wilberforce, William, on bull-baiting, 18, 55
- Windham, William, on bull-baiting, 17, 19
- Wollstonecraft, Mary, on kindness to animals, 15
- Wood, George, Patron of Society, gives £5,000 towards site of Society's building, 136
- Young, Thomas, author of "An Essay on Humanity to Animals," 14

Redwood Library

SELECTIONS FROM THE RULES

1. Three volumes may be taken at a time and only three on one share. Two unbound numbers of a monthly and three numbers of a weekly publication are counted as a volume.

2. Books other than 7-day and 14-day ones may be kept out 28 days. **Books cannot be renewed or transferred.**

3. Books overdue are subject to a fine of one cent a day for fourteen days, **and five cents a day for each day thereafter.**

4. Neglect to pay the fine will debar from the use of the Library.

5. No book is to be lent out of the house of the person to whom it is charged.

6. Any person who shall soil (deface) or damage or lose a book belonging to the Library shall be liable to such fine as the Directors may impose; or shall pay the value of the book or of the set, if it be a part of a set, as the Directors may elect. All scribbling or any marking or writing whatever, folding or turning down the leaves as well as cutting or tearing any matter from a book belonging to the Library, will be considered defacement and damage.

1Z.F16

1011 11012 10112

1011 11012 10112
1011 11012 10112
1011 11012 10112
1011 11012 10112
1011 11012 10112

WITHDRAWN

1011 11012 10112
1011 11012 10112
1011 11012 10112
1011 11012 10112
1011 11012 10112

1011 11012 10112
1011 11012 10112
1011 11012 10112
1011 11012 10112
1011 11012 10112



P9-DRO-371

